THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. Selwyn, M.A., Redhill Rectory, Havant, to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. IV FEBRUARY, 1922 No. 20

EDITORIAL

MODERNISM AND MIRACLES

The January number of the *Hibbert Journal* contains a striking criticism of the Cambridge Conference of Modern Churchmen from the pen of Dr. Foakes Jackson. His criticism concentrates itself upon the point that the Jesus depicted in the Conference papers, whatever else we may say of Him, is at any rate not the Jesus of history. For the Founder who "had commended Himself by the wonders that He wrought, and had been declared to be the Son of God with power by His rising from the dead," and was "from the first . . . the Saviour of those who believed on Him," the modern Liberal School has substituted "a gifted teacher of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man," the prophet of a social and moral ideal. But that is not what our evidence gives us. "Christianity, to most who accepted it, was essentially a supernatural faith." The work of Schweitzer and Johannes Weiss and (to judge from the review which we publish to-day) Reitzenstein also has shown that "the real Jesus Christ is far too mysterious to be accounted for by the methods of modern Liberalism."

Dr. Foakes Jackson devotes special attention to Canon Barnes's paper, the tone of which, he says, is "one of pious rationalism disguised in beautiful language." Certainly there is one page in that paper (*The Modern Churchman*, September, 1921, p. 254), which seemed to us further removed from the mind of the Church than anything else said at the Conference. It purports to give a summary of Christ's Personality and work; and the impression it makes can be best seen by a comparison. We print on the left the extract from Canon Barnes's paper, and on the right part of the passage which closes the biography

of a celebrated Victorian reformer. The similarity is such that a casual reader, who was not informed of their respective subjects beforehand, would never guess that there was any great difference between the characters portrayed.

Extract from *The Modern Churchman*, September, 1921, p. 254 f. (Paper on the Centrality of Jesus):

His natural ability was great . . . He had closely studied the writings of the greatest religious teachers of His race. He was responsive to the spiritual longings of His age. . . . The Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, the kingdom of God, Eternal Life—the whole purpose of man's existence as a creature of God was plainly set forth. The way in which the scheme was expounded showed that it was more than an intellectual construction. It was the interpretation by Jesus of human needs, longings and aspirations as He observed them in others and felt them in Himself. His own actions, His need of prayer and quiet meditation . . . the way in which He related all His teaching to the guidance of God and based it upon His sense of God's presence with Him all show that there was a profound unity between His spiritual perceptions and their intellectual expression. The richness of His spiritual life was associated with rare psychical strength. His power to cure mental disorder was remarkable. His personality was extraordinarily impressive. Moreover, with His natural ability and spiritual confidence, there was combined a character of quite singular beauty. He apparently refused to admit that He was good as God is good: yet He was so different from normal men that those who knew Him best felt that His moral perfection was Divine rather than human. He seems to have been absolutely

Extract from *The Life and Work of the Seventh Earl of Shaftesbury, K.G.*, by Edwin Hodder. Vol. iii., p. 521 f.

He was the founder of a new order of men, who, inspired by his example and infected by his enthusiasm, followed and still follow in his footsteps. His life moved steadily along in one undeviating course, everything being brought into subjection to the self-imposed work he had undertaken, and nothing attempted but in an earnest and religious spirit. There was never any halting or hesitation in his opinion or purposes. Once satisfied that a cause needed help or that it filled a place unoccupied, he went "straight onward" with it, never turning to the right hand or the left. He was intensely practical, and above all things an honest worker, and a setter of others to work. . . . He became the ordained counsellor of others, the inspirer of their activity, their referee in every difficulty, the suggester of new movements. . . . A man of singular unselfishness, of rare determination, perseverance and courage, with an unfailing perception of right and wrong, and a wise and far-reaching sagacity, he had one single aim and purpose—to do good. That undaunted courage, that burning zeal, that tender sympathy, all sprang from deep-rooted convictions of the duties and responsibilities of life as revealed in the Holy Scriptures. . . . He inspired universal confidence by the purity of his personal character, the dignity of his bearing, the accuracy and accumulation of his knowledge; and he won affection everywhere

loyal to His spiritual perception. And He did not gain a limited self-mastery by avoiding life's difficulties and dangers. His public life was full of hardship. He endured poverty, faced the dangers of popularity and hostility, lived among outcasts without defilement, spoke readily with educated men who sought to entrap Him in His speech. His character was tested to the full; and he bore the test triumphantly. . . . His spiritual greatness, His loyalty to God, that purity of heart, mind, and spirit which pierced through sham and shame as a flaming sword, brought Him to the Cross. He died. . . .

Is He alive for evermore, God's perfect witness to Himself among men? This really is the question which we ask when we enquire whether His Person and work ought to be central in human religion. We do not affirm that the Lord's Person and work have been central in Christianity in the past. . . . But can we not say that, as religion grows in richness and purity, Jesus comes to His own? Is it not true that His influence, His power to mould thought and aspiration, will endure so long as humanity, shall exist upon the earth? . . .

by tones, by looks, by gestures; by little acts of kindness recurring daily and hourly. From first to last he was a reliable man; it was known . . . that he could never be entrapped into the advocacy of anything that was not good, to gratify the claims of friends or the interests of party. His whole life was a call to others to stand fast, to quit themselves like men and to be strong. He laid his hand on the heart of his country, and caused it to beat with reviving life. . . .

His work lives on in its fruits, and it will live for ever, and he, being dead, yet speaks in lives inspired by his example, and made bright and beautiful and useful and happy by his toil. A whole generation of children has risen up to call him blessed, and a generation is rising, among whom will be found many to adopt, as the motto of their lives, the motto of his family—

Love, Serve.

We need hardly say that we do not dispute the justice of this encomium on the great Lord Shaftesbury: what does astonish and distress us is that, in a passage designed to exhibit the centrality of Jesus Christ, virtually identical language should be used. It is one thing to say that the Christian saint shines with the reflected light of his Redeemer; another to depict the Redeemer in terms proper to the saint. Canon Barnes is careful to say that he is not a Modernist, but an Evangelical. What would Simeon, what would Dale, what would Lord Shaftesbury himself have said of this passage? We can imagine the vigour of their protests. And if we ask how far it represents the impression of Christ given to us by the Synoptic Gospels, by St. Paul, or by St. John, we are bound to answer, as Dr. Foakes Jackson does, that it is not in keeping with it.

In the same article Dr. Foakes Jackson lifts the veil upon a speech delivered at the Cambridge Conference by Professor Burkitt.

"In a few words he indicated the results of his study of St. Francis of Assisi, and showed clearly that the intense adoration which he received after his death was far less due to the beauty of his life than to the belief that as the end drew near he had miraculously received the *stigmata* or marks on his hands, feet, and side. It was the same with Jesus: not the rational appreciation of Him as a teacher and moralist, but the wonder which His miracles, and, above all, His resurrection, inspired, made Him the Lord of millions who hoped for salvation through His sacrifice and triumph over the grave—though in both instances the character of the person on whom the miracles were wrought must be taken into account. And so it is, the Professor pointed out, with all that stirs man's religious feelings. There must necessarily be a miraculous element—understanding by miracle, not the old view that it is a reversal of the known laws of nature, but that it inspires wonder or marvel at something we are unable to account for. . . . But whether in the universe, or in healing, or in sacraments, or in conversion, there must be this element of wonder to promote that reverence for some power, outside ourselves and incomprehensible to us."

One of the best discussions of Miracle known to us is Professor J. Wendland's *Miracles and Christianity* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1911), translated by Dr. Mackintosh. Defining miracles as exceptional or abnormal events having religious significance, he insists that they are integral to Theism as distinct from any doctrine, whether of materialism or of pantheism, which would make of the world a closed system. For our present purpose interest lies in the qualifying words "having religious significance." They suggest a factor which the Norrisian Professor, judging from the above summary, seems to omit. Perhaps we may put it in this way: What causes miracles to be believed? The first answer is naturally, Evidence. Such and such a happening was seen, heard, experienced. And we may say that evidence of the miraculous is far more credible to-day than it was a generation ago. In the fascinating study of the Sadhu Sundar Singh which Canon Streeter and Mr. Appasamy have given us (*The Sadhu*, Macmillan, 1921, 8s. 6d. net) the authors pass no comment on the miraculous events which they record; but the reader would have to have very strong prepossessions indeed, if he were to reject the testimony.

Something more, however, is needed in order to account for the belief in miracles besides experience, whether direct or at second hand. There are many well-attested cases of the *stigmata*, for example, which have not produced the results cited by Professor Burkitt in regard to St. Francis. And by

the same token belief that our Lord's Nativity was an isolated instance of parthenogenesis is very far from the Catholic belief in the Virgin Birth. It is here that the qualifying words in Professor Wendland's definition are so important. For they postulate an atmosphere or spiritual *milieu* for which the events have their chief significance. And this atmosphere is the creation of the person or persons of whom the miracle is recorded. The result of the miracles in awakening or confirming faith is not merely that they were done by, or happened to, particular people—the prophets and saints, the Chosen People, and pre-eminently Christ Himself—but that they were appropriate to them. The notion that peasantry and uneducated folk easily believe the miraculous has been far too readily taken for granted. It ignores the fact that one of the commonest features of the peasant mind is a fatalism which is inclined to regard all novelty as containing an element of fraud. It seems that the exorcisms performed by Jews in our Lord's lifetime were regarded in this light by many of their contemporaries. What caused His exorcisms to be believed by "the common people," while theirs were not, was precisely that atmosphere of which in His case they formed a part. The film of fatalism had been already removed from the mind's eye before the mighty works were done, and the works therefore told their tale.

Can we define more precisely what dissolves that film? The cause is hidden somewhere in that mysterious complex which we call Personality; but perhaps we shall not be mistaken if we say that two elements must always be present, wherever this atmosphere is created. One is the element of consecration or Divine call. It is "men of God"—men whose lives are manifestly kindled at some unseen fire, and who speak with authority because they are themselves under authority to a super-sensible Power—who take the heart out of fatalism. And the other element is love. Fatalism nearly always conceals a sentiment of aversion, centred at first perhaps in some particular object, personal or other, but gradually drawing into its ambit the whole *gamut* of life's experiences. And only love can conquer that sentiment. For love is the proof that *all* things can be borne, believed, hoped, and endured. It exposes the narrow limits within which the iron law of necessity holds sway—narrow, that is, when seen in contrast with the potentialities set free in the soul by contact with love. And it is as these two forces functioning through a man's personality break through the mental horizon of his contemporaries, revealing an unsuspected world of freedom and power, that the atmosphere is created wherein miracles can be believed.

After all, no uniformity of natural processes can come home to the mind of the scientist so forcibly as the uniformity of life's experiences—its indifference to the individual, its monotony, its emptiness—comes home to thousands who have never heard of science nor ever uttered a prayer. And one may ask whether we have not here the explanation of much of the conflict over Miracle which was waged between Religion and Science. Once grant—as scientists do increasingly grant to-day—that the universe is not a closed, mechanical system, and the objection to Miracle is transferred from the province of Science to that of Theistic Philosophy. On the other hand, the scientist has still a special psychological obstacle in the way of belief in Miracle. For his work for the most part consists in, and depends upon, the observation and description of uniformities. The personal factor in the situation, which, as we have seen, is vital to belief in Miracle, is just that which the scientist tries most to eliminate in order to reach solid results. There have been, indeed, great men of science—a Pascal, for example, or a Kelvin—who realized that this abstraction from the personal factor was methodological only, like that of the runner who, with whole intent set upon the tape, rules out of sight and mind the bystanders round the track. But for most men the methods of thought which guide their working life mould in great part their general outlook; and there can be no doubt that what Augustine calls *abyssus humanæ conscientiæ*—"the abysmal depths of personality," as Mr. Edwyn Bevan translates it—is only now beginning to receive its meed of recognition at the hands of Science.

Mr. Bevan's short essay on Augustine as "The Prophet of Personality" in his fascinating volume, *Hellenism and Christianity* (Allen and Unwin, 1921, 12s. 6d. net), raises the question—not, indeed, for the first time—whether we should not see in this factor the peculiar contribution which the Hebraic element in Christian Theology has to make to modern knowledge.

"It was a great discovery this—of what men had been wanting so long without knowing it, the story of the heart. They had indeed been always, as Augustine calls them, 'curiosum genus ad cognoscendam vitam alienam,' and yet the classical writers had persisted in the supposition that it was only the loud actions of court and assembly and battlefield, or the pure industry of the intellect, or at any rate passion in its most obvious animal forms, which interested them. 'Personality' . . . was never distinctly conceived of by antiquity. And yet by personality men had been secretly governed all the time. And when Augustine unfolded before them a history of things not seen with the eyes, of battles waged without sound, of a kingdom that came not with observation, his book

took the world by storm. It won a place immediately among the normative influences in men's minds, which it has not lost, even among the multitudinous literature of to-day."

These words are worthy of attention, if only because the modern tendency to concentrate on Christ's Humanity in order the more easily to make terms with the scientific temper is only too apt to lead to the employment of Hellenic rather than Hebraic forms of thought for the purpose. It is incredible that our Lord's Human Nature should not have been something infinitely deeper and more mysterious than that of any Christian; and yet the delineation of it given us, for example, by the Cambridge Conference papers, seems to leave out of account elements which emerge with impressive clearness and grandeur from the *Confessions*, or the *Pensées*, from Wesley's *Journal*, or Newman's *Apologia*. We venture the claim that, when those elements are fully and fairly weighed, the problem of Miracle will be in a fair way to solution.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES IN RECENT CRITICISM

THIS article is intended to give the English reader some idea of the problems connected with the Acts as they appear in the light of a decade of criticism. I hardly like to call it a survey, lest I should challenge comparison with the inimitable lectures which Dr. Sanday used to give on phases of recent theology. Nor can I claim to have read all the books which have appeared. But I believe that all really important books will be found mentioned in the following pages. The reader will notice that the works discussed are from the pens of German, French, and American scholars. Singularly little first-hand work has been done of recent years in this country, especially if Drs. Foakes-Jackson and Lake are counted as Americans for this purpose. Further, the work has been almost entirely radical in character. No one has arisen to carry on the work of Sir William Ramsay and Von Harnack. This is due partly to the fact that it is easier to attack than to defend. There is little point in writing a book which repeats what has already been said well, whereas destructive criticism finds no difficulty in producing attractive novelties. But it must also be noted that many scholars of the front rank who have been concerned with Acts have deliberately rejected the arguments of Ramsay and Harnack as unconvincing. Doubtless there are excellent scholars on the conservative side well qualified to answer the radicals, but they happen to have been engaged on other

matters, so that their case has been in danger of going by default.

In 1912 the situation was as follows: Sir William Ramsay had written a series of books proving the accuracy of such details in Acts as could be tested by external evidence, and the intrinsic probability of many which could not. Valid as his results undoubtedly were within certain limits, their main value consisted in a demonstration that certain sections of the travel-narrative originated with an eyewitness. The argument was not equally cogent when applied to the first half of the Acts or to the speeches. And one could not help noticing that the interpolations of Codex Bezae could be, and in some instances were, justified precisely in the same manner as the traditional text, though the "Western" text as a whole is almost certainly an early paraphrastic text.

Harnack's studies on the Acts had been translated into English under the titles *Luke the Physician* (1907), *The Acts of the Apostles* (1909), and *Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels* (1911). As he proceeded he became more confident. In the first book Acts was assigned to the year 80, in the last to a date before the death of St. Paul. Harnack had no doubt whatever as to the Lukan authorship. The medical language argument of Hobart was restated and greatly strengthened by concentration on what was really telling. The general accuracy of the record was urged. "Leaving out of account a few minute details, the descriptions of the Council of Jerusalem, and of St. Paul's apology in the last speeches, in fact the whole account of his attitude towards the Jews at his last visit to Jerusalem, alone remain questionable."* However, Harnack's reaction towards conservatism was only relative. Generally speaking, he seems to consider questions of date of little importance. The real problem is how myths grew up. But the story of a miracle may well have been repeated in its present form on the morrow of the alleged event; there is no need for the historian to draw large drafts on the bank of time. The Ascension is a myth. St. Luke substituted the Acts version for the earlier and truer version of St. Luke xxiv. This is a puzzle, but less strange than the problem of St. Mark—namely, that "presented by the fact that the legendary traditions concerning Christ actually took form within the *Primitive Community* during the first thirty years, and under the very eyes of those who had witnessed the events themselves."† Harnack displays much skill in reconstructing the sources used in the first half of Acts. His main result, which he considers practically certain, is that iii. 1-16 are an earlier

* *Acts of the Apostles*, p. xxxix. † *Ibid.*, p. 158.

version of the same events which are recorded in a later and untrustworthy form in ii. 17-42.

The year 1913 was noteworthy in Acts studies. Two first-class commentaries appeared, by Preuschen and Wendt; Bousset published what Professor Lake calls an "epoch-making" work in his *Kyrios Christos;* Norden, approaching the New Testament from the classical standpoint, took the theologians of Germany by storm with his wonderful *Agnostos Theos;* and Dr. Foakes-Jackson began his seminar at Jesus College, Cambridge, of which *The Beginnings of Christianity* is a result. Norden's book deserves careful study, the others a brief notice.

Wendt's commentary is a thorough working over of the previous edition of Acts, by himself, in Meyer's series. It is marked by much learning and sober judgment, though he and Preuschen both adhere to the redactor theory. Preuschen's book is a brilliant piece of compressed scholarship; the small amount of space available is chiefly occupied by illustrative material from which the trained scholar can draw his own conclusions. Bousset sets himself this problem: How did Jesus come to be deified? How was the dividing line between God and Jesus broken down? He finds firm ground in the primitive community at Jerusalem, which took over the title "Son of Man" (*i.e., the* heavenly Man depicted in Daniel and elsewhere) and the circle of ideas connected with it.* The Son of David conception receded into the background—it was obviously unattainable. But the hopes raised during the ministry, and disappointed by the Crucifixion, revived with the help of the Son of Man ideas. Bousset makes little use of Acts, but he cannot be disregarded here, for he has set an example likely to be extensively followed in attaching immense importance to Antioch. Between St. Paul and the primitive Palestinian community stands Antioch, where universalized Christianity arose without Paul's help on Hellenistic ground. The apostle asserts his independence as against Jerusalem, not against Antioch. It was here that Christ came to be called Lord, the Greek form of which, *Kyrios,* is not a translation of the Syriac *Mari* or *Maran,* nor the designation of Jehovah in the Septuagint, but the Hellenistic title for a god who is lord of a particular cult—for example, Serapis. In effect, then, the Jewish Christians at Jerusalem and the Hellenistic Christians at Antioch meant the same thing when they called Jesus "Son of Man and Lord respectively. Professor Headlam† dis-

* Though he will not allow that Jesus used it of Himself, for how could Jesus have conceived of Himself as a man from heaven!

† In *Church Quarterly Review,* January, 1921.

misses the theory too contemptuously. Though Bousset broke off all links with historic Christianity, there is nothing repugnant to orthodoxy, so far as I can see, in supposing that his version of the facts is in the main true, though we may well interpret their meaning far differently. In any case Antioch, the Church which claimed St. Peter as its first Bishop, sent out Paul and Barnabas on their mission, and produced Ignatius, must have played a more important part than would be deduced from the amount of space devoted to its affairs in the Acts.

Norden's *Agnostos Theos* is a thesaurus of passages illustrating the religious life of apostolic times. His main thesis is that there were certain fixed types of preaching which recur in Jewish, Hellenistic, and Christian surroundings. Much of his work is of great and permanent value, though it proves what no one had thought it worth while to doubt. Two of his arguments claim our attention here, respecting the Areopagus speech in Acts xvii. and the composition of the book as a whole. The thesis, so far as it concerns the Areopagus speech, will be briefly summarized and answered with the help of Harnack's convincing reply.*

Not only the speech, but the whole situation in which it occurs, is composed from traditional material, so Norden maintains. To praise Athens for piety was a *locus communis*. But the actual source of the section in Acts was the story of the visit of Apollonius of Tyana to Athens in the middle of the first century A.D. Apollonius visited Athens, noted the piety of the inhabitants, and wrote a little book on the subject, in which he criticized the Eleusinian hierophant who had refused to initiate him into the mysteries.† A quotation from this book is preserved by Eusebius, *Præp. Ev.* iv. 13, which contains a polemic against idolatry agreeing with that which Philostratus puts into Apollonius' mouth during his visit to Egypt.‡ Norden concludes that the author of Acts used a report of Apollonius' visit to Athens as a model for his own narrative, and changed the plural of the inscription into the singular, which suited his purpose better.§ The only real agreement, beyond the obvious fact that St. Paul and Apollonius both visited Athens, saw its temples, and preached against idolatry, lies in the alleged fact that St. Paul based his address upon an

* *Ist die Rededes Paulus in Athen ein ursprünglicher Bestandteil der Apostelgeschichte,* ? 1913.

† Philostratus, *Vit. Apoll.*, iv. 18, 19.

‡ *Vit. Apoll.*, vi. 19; *cf.* vi. 3, where Apollonius refers to βωμοὶ ἀγνώστων δαιμόνων at Athens.

§ Jerome (on Titus i. 12) had given a similar explanation. "The inscription of the altar was not, as Paul asserted, 'to the unknown god,' but this—'To the gods of Asia, Europe, and Africa, to the unknown and stranger gods.' But because Paul was not in need of a number of unknown gods, but only of one unknown god, he used the singular verb in order to teach that his god was what the Athenians had predicted on the title of the altar."

altar to the Unknown God, Apollonius his on an altar to unknown gods. But this critical factor as regards Apollonius is not found in the passages quoted, but is a highly problematical supposition on the part of Norden. Anyone interested need only look up the passages—there is an English version in the Loeb Library—and decide for himself the value of the new argument. After all, Philostratus' work belongs to the third century A.D. A certain difficulty remains. St. Paul is said to have altered the title of the inscription. An altar to the unknown gods is clearly a precaution lest in a city given to idolatry any gods should have been omitted. It is rank superstitition. Whereas the Unknown God may designate the Great Unseen Whom men are honestly seeking in all their cults. But Jerome's explanation is perfectly satisfactory. The apostle starts from a common object of the city, and by a slight but radical alteration of its inscription startles his audience into attention. No one is deceived by the skilful oratorical device.

Norden's theory of the composition of Acts deserves attention because it expresses in a rather startling way the theories of "redaction" still largely prevalent on the Continent. The redactor, writing about 100, uses an existing narrative, into which he interpolates the speeches and other matter. The "we-sections" delude us if we seek firm ground. It was a common literary device to ring the changes on the first and third persons in historical narrative.* Even the famous voyage story in chapter xxvii. may be an existing story adapted to the redactor's purpose. Harnack attacks this redactor-theory very vigorously, concentrating on the Areopagus speech. The speech is an integral part of the narrative, the narrative an integral part of the Acts. There is nothing in ideas or language to make it unlikely that the passage was spoken or written in the middle of the first century. It forms one of three set speeches put in the apostle's mouth to show his methods—addressed to Jews (xiii.), to heathen (xvii.), and to the faithful (xx.). The peculiar words suit the occasion, and are well within the capacity of an author who began his Gospel with a classical prologue, wrote chapters i. and ii. in a strongly Septuagintal style, and went on in chapter iii. in yet another style. The redactor, if such there was, must have been Luke's *Doppelgänger*.†

* Many examples are given. Ezra viii. 31–36 can be tested by every reader.

† The whole argument about literary parallels has been greatly overdone. Probably the vast mass of all so-called quotations in the New Testament are borrowed from the common speech of the day, not from books at all. So we quote Shakespeare daily without knowing it. Writers like Norden suffer from their ignorance of the Old Testament. For example: "He made of one every nation of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth" (Acts xvii. 26) is said to be Stoic. A Sunday-school child might answer him by quoting Gen. ix. 19: "These three were the sons of Noah; and of these was the whole earth overspread."

Great advantage accrues to New Testament study from the advent of scholars from other fields of investigation, who can look upon vexed problems with trained critical faculties and fresh eyes. Norden came from classics, Wellhausen from the Old Testament. After a lifetime of research into its problems, in old age he attacked the Gospels, his notes on which were remarkable. Steeped in Semitic thought and language, he saw instinctively points which had missed previous investigators. I deduce the importance of his 1914 book on the Acts* from the attention given to it in subsequent books. It is very short, only fifty-six pages, and states dogmatically, without serious argument, what belongs to the original sources and what to the redactor. This seriously detracts from the value of his work, and in any case it is difficult to be patient with a writer who, referring to the dying out of ecstatic phenomena, permits himself the expression that the Church "pickled the Holy Ghost." I give a few specimens of his contentions. Time after time he sees difficulties where there are none. If his theory of sources were justified by the recovery of documents, no doubt he would be proved to have made some lucky shots, but most of his attempts would inevitably be far from the mark.

The two men in Acts i. 10 are Moses and Elijah, as in the Transfiguration story. In chapter viii., verses 14, 15, 16, 18a, 19b come from the redactor, and "in this matter," then, refers to the power of healing, which Simon tried to buy. Chapters ix., x., xi., xiii., xiv. are legendary. Thus of x. he says: "If that for which Paul fought had already, thanks to Peter, come to be recognized in its fullest extent at Jerusalem, then not merely would the narrative of Gal. ii. have to go, but also that of Acts xv. would be unthinkable." (Everyone must be logical. Never could the Church have taken a step without realizing the consequences. As if it was not the commonest thing in life to say, we will do something but it must not be taken as a precedent! Cornelius was an exceptional case, an isolated "God-fearer," and it might well have been left to subsequent reflection to show that the principle of admitting Gentiles in great numbers had been conceded.) In xi. 22, Barnabas is sent to inspect and report. He did neither, but stopped on at Antioch. (Were there no such things as letters? St. Luke assumes some common sense in his readers.) The Ephesus story in chapter xix. was originally described an anti-Jewish riot; it was adapted for its present purpose by the redactor. In xx. 29 ("after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in, etc.") we have a *vaticinium ex eventu*. (But

* *Kritische Analyse der Apostelgeschichte*, Berlin, 1914. A previous work *Noten zur Apostelgeschichte* was published in 1907.

what missionary in Africa would not venture upon a similar prediction, if foreign help were about to be withdrawn from the native church?) Chapters xxi.-xxvi. are puzzling to Wellhausen, as to most other recent writers. Why this absurd prolongation of the agony? But the simplest explanation is that the novel and puzzling situation caused the delay. A new cult, apparently Jewish but repudiated by Judaism, championed by a Roman citizen—what were the authorities to do? Probably they played for time in the hope that the problem would solve itself. The modern world has evolved a method of referring to a committee for consideration and report. We must not be too severe on the ancient world for not having discovered this plan.

Our next book is of a very different type. Johannes Weiss died in August, 1914, and his unfinished work, *Das Urchristentum*, was completed from manuscripts by Professor Knopf, and appeared in 1917. Let me say at once, for I shall have to criticize it, what a noble book it is. Conceived on a grand scale, dealing with the whole problem of primitive Christianity, showing unrivalled knowledge, acute insight, and often real spiritual perception—I can think of no similar book which remotely approaches it. Let no one be tempted to buy it unless he is prepared to give many weeks to its study. But if he is, then the book is well worth the purchase money. Considerable space is devoted to Acts. We are warned at the outset that Acts is dominated by the artistic conception of the development of the Gentile mission from the primitive community, under the patronage of the Church at Jerusalem and the original apostles. Christianity for its author is Judaism brought to its logical completion and become a world religion in place of the old national religion sunk in unbelief and hardness of heart. The kernel of the book was probably written by Luke, the companion of Paul, before the latter's death. The original book was written for Roman readers who knew Paul personally, so no description of the apostle was necessary. Chapter xxvii. and its predecessors are dictated by the necessity of explaining to the Roman public, including Paul's judges, how this wonderful man came to Rome. The Acts as we now have it is a writing up of Luke's work. The Roman Church put Peter and Paul together, Acts gave literary expression to its verdict. The redactor did his work incompletely, and left some of the "we's" of the original narrative through carelessness. The speeches were his composition and reflect the average conceptions which prevailed at the end of the first century; an exception is made of some primitive elements in the speeches of the early chapters.

All this is conventional enough, but frequently J. Weiss uses the language of robust common sense as he contends against current judgments. Thus, that St. Paul went to the Jews first, as Acts declares, is clear from Rom. ix.-xi.; it is no "schematism" on Luke's part. There is not the slightest reason to doubt the Sergius Paulus incident in chapter xiii. The error of those who think Paul did not preach about the life of Jesus is extraordinary. Did he alone in the apostolic age forego this? His epistles are not mission-sermons, but are addressed to believers and presuppose knowledge of the tradition enshrined in the gospels. The story of the gaoler at Philippi is quite intelligible if we do not weigh it with measures suited to German officials; any man who had cast out a demon would be deemed equipped with supernatural forces. The transition to the Gentile mission took place naturally and imperceptibly at the time of the persecution. Christians were won at Antioch, and common meals were observed (Gal. ii. 11). But how could Jews eat with impure heathen? Baptism was regarded as the purifier, and took the place of circumcision. It already implied a death and rising again, and the meanings developed by Paul were there in all essentials.

The importance of Antioch is well expressed. There first arose a considerable body of Christians who had not known Christ in the flesh and so worshipped Him as the invisible Lord; henceforth the eschatological and Messianic elements in Christianity began to recede. But how is this cultus to be explained? "The problem is not the appearance of a cultus, but that of a cultus which attaches itself to a man who had recently died but was now exalted to Godhead, and this among men who have had absolutely no connections with this personality" (p. 576).

So admirable is the book in many ways, so clearly is the author feeling his way to a very high conception of the divine mystery at work in the apostolic age, that one grieves over his personal alienation from historic Christianity. This is summed up in a remarkable sentence: "Strange as these things have become to us, we cannot too earnestly make ourselves familiar with the thought, that the old Christianity understood the 'new life' not merely as a new mode of thought or moral conduct, but as a wonderful equipment with new powers, the work of God" (p. 188). *Strange as these things have become to us.* What a pathetic confession! These brilliantly gifted men are strangers to the veriest commonplaces of Christian experience. Need we look further for an explanation of their failure to understand primitive Christianity?

We pass on to two American books—C. C. Torrey, *The Composition and Date of Acts* (Harvard University Press, 1916),

and H. J. Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke* (Harvard, 1919). Dr. Torrey maintains that Acts i.-xv. is an obvious translation of an Aramaic source. The translator of i.-xv. was the author of xvi.-xxviii. "The Greek of Acts xvi.-xxviii. is not 'like that of the LXX,' to say nothing of the widely diverse Book of Maccabees." Nor does i.-xv. sound like the *Koiné* as regards language. Many instances of Aramaisms are given, care being taken to eliminate phrases which are Hebrew as well as Aramaic. At first sight Torrey's arguments seem cogent, but Professor Burkitt does not accept his test passages,* and the theory requires further examination by specialists before it can be profitably discussed by non-Semitic scholars.

Professor Cadbury's book can be appreciated by every Greek scholar. It is largely composed of word-lists, each of which represents many toilsome hours. Some of his judgments are extremely valuable. "Whether a word used by Luke occurs in another writing depends far more on the chance of subject matter and the size of the writings compared than on any real affinity of writing." "In a collection like the New Testament the occurrence of a word is often merely an accident; and the words so distinguished are not characteristic of him. On the other hand, some really unusual words or words of significance for a writer's vocabulary are thus left out of account because another writer in the New Testament happened to use the word" (pp. 5, 6). The chief interest in the book is the author's examination of the argument from medical language. He accounts for it by the fact that the simpler medical terms are naturally on the lips of educated men. On the lines of Hobart and Harnack it would be easy to prove that Josephus, Lucian, Philo, and Plutarch were doctors. Professor Cadbury actually works out this thesis for Lucian. "So Luke, 'the beloved physician' and companion of Paul, may have written the two books which tradition assigns to him, though the Greek was no more medical than that of Lucian, 'the travelling rhetorician and show-lecturer'; but the so-called medical language of these books cannot be used as a proof that Luke was their author, nor even as an argument confirming the tradition of his authorship" (p. 51). Professor G. F. Moore contributes a delightful note on p. 53. Our medical words are Greek and can hardly be used confidently except by those with technical knowledge. But Greek was the language of the New Testament writers, who employed its terms proportion-

* See *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1919, pp. 320-329. Bacon discusses the matter in *American Journal of Theology*, 1918, pp. 1-23, and Torrey supplements his book in *American Journal of Theology*, 1919, pp. 61-86, 189-212.

ately to the extent of their vocabulary. Thus κραιπάλη is claimed as a medical term. But Galen, actually quoted by Wettstein on Luke xxi. 31, says: "All the Greeks call headaches caused by wine κραιπάλας." It was "the vulgar word for that very vulgar experience. . . . And κραιπάλη is only a peculiarly crass example of a pervasive fallacy in the discussion of Luke's 'technical language.'" Professor Cadbury's arguments seem to me unanswerable.*

If the plan of Professors Foakes-Jackson and Lake is worked out fully, their book on *The Beginnings of Christianity* will rank as the most important of its kind in English. The first volume contributes comparatively little to our special subject. Questions of authorship are reserved for the second volume. Apparently, the editors take a radical view, for they speak on p. 323 of "the redactor of Acts"; but Professor Lake, in his article on Acts in the *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, tentatively accepts St. Luke as the author. In the discussion before us we are warned not to trust the writer. Acts i. is clearly unhistorical. A Galilean tradition was altered to a Jerusalem one. Luckily we have Mark to keep us straight. But the author has covered up his traces so skilfully that great caution is necessary in the rest of chapters i.-xv., where there is no Mark available. Noteworthy is the insistence that Christianity began as a synagogue in Jerusalem; the Seven represented liberal Hellenizing Judaism; Peter went over from James to them, and was persecuted while James was spared; the Seven were the first to practise baptism in the name of the Lord Jesus.

Finally, we reach Loisy's huge book (approaching half a million words), *Les Actes des Apôtres* (Paris, 1920). This is an exhaustive commentary written from an extreme radical standpoint. Luke, he maintains, saw the birth of Christianity at Antioch, and about the year 80 wrote two books for an important Christian. He put all his pains into them, but they were beyond the appreciation of the Church of his day, and only débris have reached us. Our Canonical Luke and Acts are the work of a redactor about the year 100, who reshaped the original books and thus gave them the appearance of linguistic unity. Authors of that day were no more prepared to see their work falsified than they are nowadays. R.'s work was not in accordance with contemporary standards of honesty. One would like to think it was his private action, but more

* I reached a similar conclusion in an essay written in 1914, published in Foakes-Jackson and Lake's second volume (1922). It so happens that two distinguished English medical men, Drs. Wickham Legg and Cuthbert Atchley, are experts in ecclesiology. It would be an impertinence to seek for evidences of their medical knowledge in their ecclesiological writings.

probably it was the concerted action of the Roman Church, which suppressed Luke's genuine books in favour of the new versions. R. rewrote history from the point of view of Clement I., also a corporate act of the Roman Church. The object was to show that Christianity was not a new sect opposed to the laws, but the authentic form of the Jewish religion: the official tolerance due to the Jews also belonged to Christianity. The method is a mere travesty of history. Only the framework of history is preserved; it is filled in with free inventions—miracles, discourses, doublets, etc. The Church is shown to be a kingdom of the Spirit, ruled over by elders and overseers, disobedience to whom is fatal—witness Ananias and Sapphira. The special Christology of Acts is deliberate archaism.

The difficulty was that the Jews denied all this. So they were presented as the villains of the piece, blinded from the beginning and always unbelieving. The parallelism of the Peter and Paul narratives is intentional. Paul was already in a high place in the documents before the redactor, but Peter's position is made for him by the Roman Church, already laying the foundation of its Petrine primacy.

Well, after all, the redactor failed. The Roman Empire did not take his view. But he succeeded in deceiving the Church as to its origin.

Some of the greatest Lives of Christ, said Schweitzer, were written in hate. One is loth to say such a thing of this book; nevertheless, it seems to have been written by an ex-Roman priest in a gush of bitter hate, which has quite perverted his judgment. Here are some of his comments. On Acts xvi. 25: "All is now ready for the miracle. *But about midnight Paul and Silas were praying and singing hymns unto God*—very loud—*and the prisoners*—the other prisoners, every self-respecting prison must be well filled—*were listening to them*—having nothing better to do." On xxiii. 16 he remarks that we must not ask whence this young man appears, nor how it comes to pass that Paul has a nephew there and is so well provided with relations at Jerusalem.

M. Loisy shows the absurdity of most of Acts. Nothing worse could be written; and it is always a comfort to know the worst. Granted that the method is right, that an ancient document may be treated as a criminal and browbeaten by a bullying barrister; granted that Cicero or Cæsar may be allowed to speak of someone's nephew, but if the Bible does you may sneeringly ask how comes this young man to drop from the skies; granted that a passage like the conversion of Saul, full of spiritual succour to mankind in all ages, is a fit subject for

bitter mockery—then M. Loisy has written a book damaging to the Catholic faith.

Next month I hope to sum up the results of ten years' debate, and show where in my opinion we stand to-day.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

TWO FIGURES IN FRENCH RELIGION

I.—ST. FRANCIS DE SALES AS SPIRITUAL DIRECTOR.

Nearly every priest has, in some measure or other, to be a director of souls. His work in the confessional will frequently entail the giving of advice, and it may be that the progress of souls in the interior life will depend largely on whether the advice he gives is good or not. It is obviously, therefore, of great importance that he should fit himself, as far as he can, to give wise and good direction. Doubtless he will learn much by experience, both the experience which comes to him from watching his own spiritual states, and that which comes from dealing with others. But this alone, though it is all the knowledge that some priests possess, is not sufficient. There is need also of study. We have a large body of literature, written by great spiritual guides in the course of their work, from which we can also learn. These books form our professional literature just as much as do the works of the great dogmatic theologians—St. Thomas Aquinas and others. If we study them we are on the way to make ourselves more efficient priests, and we shall approach with greater confidence the difficult problems of direction that come before us. It seems to me that it is a good practice, at any rate at the beginning, to make a thorough study of the direction of one man; to saturate oneself, as it were, with his methods, and to endeavour to find out what it was that made him so supremely efficient a guide of souls. In this paper an attempt is made to study St. Francis de Sales in this light. It is doubtful if we could find a better subject for study. M. Fortunat Strowski, the author of an admirable book on him, has called him, speaking of his spiritual direction, *le maître dans cet art difficile*, and the men and women whom he guided were men and women living in a society not at all unlike ours at the present day. The devout people for whom and to whom he wrote in the seventeenth century were very like the devout people in Catholic circles in the twentieth. They had the same difficulties, the same weaknesses, and the same scruples.

In saying that St. Francis de Sales wrote for devout people I intend to lay emphasis upon the kind of direction we may

expect to find in him. He is not writing for beginners. The average priest, engaged in parochial work, will find that much of his direction is necessarily concerned with those who have hardly begun to make any advance. They are still struggling, possibly with many relapses, with mortal sin. Their horizon is at present bounded by victory over that. They need skilled, common-sense advice, which most priests are capable of giving because they have passed through the same furnaces themselves. The help we get from St. Francis will be with regard to a different type of soul. In most congregations there are a number of devout people who are interested in the spiritual life, have made perhaps some progress, and are anxious to make more. Not all these, of course, have the same spiritual capacities. Some of them may be only those who enjoy church-going, which is by no means always an indication of a vigorous interior life; while others may belong to that select band who are called to the higher paths of contemplative prayer. It is in their dealings with souls of this kind—the naturally devout, whatever their spiritual attainments—that Anglican priests often fail because they do not know what to advise. Souls under their direction never seem to go forward. Their penitents, year after year, are still struggling with the same difficulties. And they may be so accustomed to this state of things that they do not worry about it. Well, they will get a great deal of help from St. Francis de Sales. His books sprang from his direction. *The Introduction to the Devout Life* had its origin in the guidance of Mme. de Charmoisy, a young society woman, living in the world and enjoying it, but eager for spiritual advance; the book on *The Love of God* was built up from the saint's guidance of that wonderfully gifted soul, Mme. de Chantal. No priest can study them from this point of view without being the wiser for it. He is putting himself to school with a good master. But it is in the volumes of his correspondence especially that we shall learn most of St. Francis's methods of dealing with all sorts and conditions of men and women, with those in the world and those in the cloister.

One thing the student will learn very quickly from him is to be on the look-out for *amour propre*, for self-love. Of course, directly we begin to know anything of ourselves we are appalled at the way self appears to thrust itself into everything. It seems that there is an admixture of evil even in our best acts. We are inclined to agree with the cynical maxims of La Rochefoucauld and to believe that everything we do, if only we can dig deep enough into motive, springs from fundamental *amour propre*. But St. Francis de Sales knew quite as much about *amour propre* as La Rochefoucauld. He knew that it was

impossible altogether to root it out. But that did not mean that we were to give up the battle and to assume that spiritual perfection was beyond us. You cannot tear self-love, he says, out of the human heart, but you can check its manifestations, you can prevent the production of the sins which are its fruits. The skilled director will point out where sin comes in. Frequently he will hear people accuse themselves in their confessions of self-love when in reality there is no sin, but only an impatience with an obstacle to perfection. *Il faut donc avoir patience*, says St. Francis; we must be patient with our imperfections; *l'amour propre ne meurt jamais qu'avec nos corps.* Sometimes even self-love may be found lurking behind our austerities, which then become *les œuvres de l'amour propre.* It is easy to see how deception may come. It is possible, for instance, to conquer a sin by an appeal to self-love. It is a fairly short and easy way with some persons if one appeals to their pride when there is some fault, possibly a sin of the body, to be overcome. Schoolmasters will get certain results by insisting that gentlemen don't do this or that. Scoutmasters often make the same appeal to their boys: "A scout doesn't do this." But though the sin may be conquered, it is very doubtful if the person's spiritual condition is any better than it was before. One sin is gone, it is true, but it has been replaced by something that is far more subtle, far more dangerous to the interior life. What has happened is that the publican has become a Pharisee. Doctors might often cure people by means of a drug, but they hesitate to do it because they know that they will be opening the door to a far graver peril. We can learn, in reading the constant warnings of St. Francis against *amour propre*, not lightly to enlist it as an ally against sin. Those who do this are like a country enlisting the help of one band of pirates to free them from another. The immediate end will be attained, but soon the country will be suffering from a still crueller and more grinding tyranny.

I quoted St. Francis just now as saying that we must be patient with ourselves. His insistence on the need of this is one of the chief marks of his direction. He found so many people who were inclined to be discouraged if they were not able at once to get the better of their faults. Every confessor comes across frequent instances of this. Penitents complain that they seem to make no progress. Some of them are continually changing their confessor on this account. It springs from an impatience which is not in the least justified. This is what St. Francis says:

"You complain because certain imperfections and defects

are found in your life, contrary to the desire which you have for perfection and for the purity of your love of God. I reply that it is not possible for us to get rid of ourselves entirely while we are still living here. We must then have patience, and not think that we can be healed in a day of all the bad habits we have contracted owing to the small amount of care we formerly had for our spiritual health."

Even, he says, there might be great danger that the soul would become proud and vain if in one moment it becomes perfectly mistress of itself. Here is another passage:

"Know that the virtue of patience is that which assures us most of perfection, and if it is necessary to have patience with others, it is necessary also to have it with oneself. Those who aspire to the pure love of God have not so much need of patience with others as need of patience with themselves. We must suffer our imperfection in order to have perfection; I say suffer with patience, and not love or caress it: humility is nourished by this sufferance."

How beautifully the gentleness of St. Francis shows itself here. He is never rough; never tyrannizes over people and never frightens them. Always gentle with his penitents, he always sent them away comforted, but never allowed them to think that the way to perfection was easy. But he must always have made them feel that it was possible. Be patient with yourself! What a cordial for drooping courage, but what a powerful exercise also in humility! Certainly they never went away feeling that it was no use trying.

Naturally we shall ask what St. Francis advises in cases of desolation and dryness. Such states are very common, and all souls who have begun to advance experience them. But nearly always there is great distress at first. It is thought that, if sensible sweetness is withdrawn, something must be seriously wrong. Some will even accuse themselves of this as if it were a sin, or at any rate will assume that it is necessarily the result of sin. But St. Francis understands better. He urges that the service we render to God in the midst of dryness is more agreeable to him than that which we give in the midst of consolations. We ought, he says, to accept it, for very likely the state of dryness is more profitable to us, as the food we like is not always the food that agrees with us best. To encourage our suffering in this way he says: *Notre Seigneur vous traite déjà en brave fille, vivez aussi un peu comme cela.* Probably the lady who received that letter felt that a new light was thrown over the whole situation. God was no longer treating her as a child to be encouraged by sweets, but as a grown-up person who could be trusted. "Better it is," St. Francis goes on in his own

inimitable way, "to eat bread without sugar than sugar without bread." Especially he insists that communion should not be abandoned in time of desolation. Yet this is what many wish to do. They do not feel devotion; consequently they think they should stay away. We learn better from St. Francis de Sales.

St. Francis had a method in dealing with souls—what M. Strowski, in a book to which I have always alluded, calls a pedagogy of souls. Those are three stages, as it were, through which he builds up the interior life in those who sought his assistance. The first of them is the examination of conscience. Here, no doubt, we can trace something of the influence of St. Ignatius of Loyola, who had laid immense stress on the importance of self-examination, both general and particular. The object of this is to get a good diagnosis of the case, in order to understand fully what there is to be done. Next there comes the regular practice of meditation or mental prayer, than which there is nothing more powerful to influence the soul. As Marcus Aurelius said: "The soul is dyed the colour of its thoughts." Or you may find the same idea in Emerson when he said: "Our real action is in our silent moments." St. Francis allowed nothing to interfere with meditation. Writing to a busy person he says: "Half-an-hour daily, if possible; if not that, then a quarter of an hour, and, to gain time, you may make your meditation, if you will, when you are hearing mass. However difficult it is found it is not to be given up. The trouble which you have will not lessen its value before God who prefers the services which one renders to him in the midst of interior and exterior difficulties to those given when everything is easy and pleasant." Finally, in this training of the soul, there comes the practice of virtues. Thought must issue in action. Habits must be formed. Quite a common heading to his letters is *Exhortation à la pratique des vertus*. He does not recommend a great amount of vocal prayer, and the director who takes him as a model will be on the watch against an Anglican tendency, fostered by books of devotion, to multiply such prayers.

Finally, he is urgent about the distinction to be made between imperfection and venial sin. One who, besides being a great spiritual guide himself, has written on St. Francis, says that the saint one day, after hearing Mme. Acarie's confession, "remarked that she accused herself of a great many things which were not even venial faults but simple fragilities. He told her that she must not confuse imperfection, which marks our every action with the seal of human weakness, with venial sin, where there enters the deliberate will to offend God." Hardly any advice is more needed than this. Everyone who

hears confessions knows how frequently this confusion occurs. Involuntary wandering of thought in prayer, for instance, is often mentioned as a grave sin, and unless the distinction is pointed out souls are rendered unhappy and discouraged. Imperfection we cannot avoid; sin we can. Every director should be on the watch against this mistake. Amid all that is of value that we can learn from a study of St. Francis de Sales as a spiritual guide there is perhaps nothing more valuable than this.

II. A TWENTIETH-CENTURY SOLITARY.*

PROBABLY there are not a few who, like the present writer, used, when they were young, to read the stories of the old hermits with a certain wistfulness. How much more interesting religion was in those days when the Egyptian desert was full of solitaries, or when St. Cuthbert retired to his lonely island. Still, all that belonged to the past. Hermits, we were brought up to believe, or took for granted, like pirates, no longer troubled the peace or the comfort of the modern world. They had disappeared before the advance of civilization, and were not now to be expected. Christianity had changed. No more miracles, no more hermits, no more supernatural heroism, but well-worked parishes, charming cathedral closes, and, abroad, medical and industrial missions, clothing the savage and teaching him to work. That is how religion presented itself to our minds; as something necessary, indeed, but inevitably a little dull, and as devoid of all romance as a solicitor's office. One cannot help admiring the superior wisdom of the Church of Rome, teaching that you may expect a miracle or a hermit any day. Religion becomes at once an exciting thing, something to inflame the imagination of a generous-minded boy, and is no longer regarded merely as a tiresome tutor saying "Don't."

Still, there must have been many who, in their heart of hearts, were rebellious against modern ideas. The love of God had taken this form in the past; why should it not do so again? Then came Kipling's story, in *The Second Jungle Book*, of the Indian Prime Minister who, at the height of his career, abandoned everything to become a hermit in the Himalayas. If this was possible in Hinduism, surely it was possible, too, in Christianity. So the mind was tempted to play with the possibility. Why should not a hermit appear, say, on some Bahama cay, or on some lonely African mountain? Might not the coloured races be called to take up the succession? And all the time, though little we knew it, a white man was

* *Charles de Foucauld: Explorateur de Maroc, Ermite au Sahara.* Par René Bazin. (Paris, Plon-Nourrit et Cie. 10 fr.)

living the hermit life in the old fashion among the wild Mohammedan tribes of the African desert. Knowledge came of it in this way. Turning over the pages of the *Revue des Deux Mondes* one murky autumn afternoon in a London club, the writer came across a short notice of a new work by M. René Bazin, the novelist, which it appeared was the biography of a man who was described as "Explorer of Morocco. Hermit in the Sahara." What, one said, a hermit, a real hermit, in these days! There was no delay in ordering that book. And, when it came, it was better even than expected. Here, indeed, was a career packed full of adventure, but showing at the same time the most extraordinary faith and the most merciless asceticism. Imagine a traveller some eight or ten years ago passing through the country of the savage Tuareg tribes in the middle of the Sahara. He would have found there a man, obviously a Frenchman, living quite alone; spending most of his time in prayer and the rest in study; saying Mass daily without any assistant, by special papal dispensation, since there might not be another Christian within hundreds of miles; and regarded with the greatest respect by all the natives and called by them "the Christian marabout." And, if he pursued his enquiries, he would find out that this shabby, middle-aged ascetic was Charles de Foucauld, a French viscount; a distinguished soldier in his young days; one of the earliest explorers of Morocco, with a brilliant exploit in disguise to his credit; who, just when the world seemed at his feet, threw it all up for this. M. Bazin's story of his extraordinary career is one that all who can should read, for it is the record of perhaps the most marvellous exhibition of Christian love and fortitude that modern times have witnessed.

If we ask what is the dominant idea which lies behind such a life as this, the answer must be, one supposes, that it is the desire for sacrifice. Charles de Foucauld, and men like him, wish to give up not something but everything. So we see them stripping themselves of all that makes life worth having for most of us—a successful career, intellectual enjoyment, pleasant food, agreeable companionship—in order to be entirely for Christ alone. It is the sacrifice of all earthly happiness in order to enjoy spiritual happiness more fully. A hermit does not give up now in order that he may enjoy hereafter; he obtains his reward here and now. Charles de Foucauld was not miserable at Beni-Abbès or at Tamanrasset. Far from it; he was entirely happy. He did not know what loneliness was so long as he had God. Lives like his are a wonderful testimony to the value of spiritual things, and prove that Christianity has not lost its ancient power. They come, moreover, as a sharp challenge to

all of us concerning our Christian ideal. Probably there will be plenty to regard his as a wasted life, and to admire more the athletic Christian at the head of his troop of Boy Scouts. But which, after all, is in the best Christian tradition ?

G. C. Rawlinson.

IDEALS AND ACHIEVEMENTS AT THE OLD VIC

The fact that the Editor has asked the Vic Management for an article is sufficient proof that the work of the Theatre is appreciated, and that it is bearing fruit much further afield than could have been hoped for in 1879, when its noble founder, Emma Cons, a pioneer of modern social service, acquired the freehold through public subscription to provide a place of healthy recreation, free from the sale of intoxicating drink, with all its attendant evils.

The need for such a place of recreation was brought home to her very strongly in connection with her work on the problem of the better housing of the poor, with which she first became familiar when, as a seventeen-year-old Sunday-School teacher, she visited the homes of the children. She taught at St. John's, Fitzroy Square, under Dr. Moorhouse, who was later Bishop of Melbourne and afterwards Bishop of Manchester.

At the Ladies' Guild she first met Octavia Hill, with whom she was in after life closely associated on housing and philanthropic work, and about the same time, John Ruskin, who greatly admired her artistic qualities.

She became an artist of some achievement, a glass painter, and manuscript illuminator of outstanding merit. Her beautiful windows from Powell's workshops are scattered in various churches up and down the country. Possessed of a good contralto voice, Emma Cons was a member of the Handel Festival Choir, and it is interesting to recall that the address to the great singer, Madame Sainton Dolby, on her retirement, was illuminated by a member of the choir, Emma Cons. Her illuminated manuscripts and designs of church windows were often exhibited, and bore favourable comparison with the work of medieval craftsmen.

We believe that she was also the first woman watch engraver. Fearing the ill-feeling of the men in the trade, John Walker, a great friend of her father's, occasionally brought in his pocket some of his choicest specimens for her to work upon.

She was thorough and practical in all her ways, and at last there came a time when she had to consider whether art or the

people had first claim on her life, and finally she decided to throw up art. In so doing she mortally offended Ruskin, who never forgave her for forsaking art.

She was full of sympathy for progressive thought, and recognized the necessity for co-operation with elected authorities. She was one of the first women co-opted on the London County Council, and helped in the development of the higher education of the people, of which Morley College remains as the memorial. She was one of those personalities which are impressive by their emptiness of self; so she had the strength of many friends, and rich people were glad to spend money at her direction. It was her triumph, when after strenuous years of work on housing and public health matters, her friends united to build Surrey Lodge, a large block of industrial buildings in Lambeth. When she was building these and living in a workman's cottage there, her mind naturally turned to the Old Vic, a place of bad repute, and an evil influence on her tenants. She immediately set about obtaining possession of it.

The old playhouse at the corner of the New Cut was rather unpromising material. The Royal Coburg—or, as it had later been rechristened, the Royal Victoria—Theatre had been in its time a dignified and respectable place of fashion, and had advertised such names on its playbills as Kean, Macready, Phelps; but it had latterly fallen on distinctly evil days, and become the home of melodrama of the most lurid description. The audience was notorious throughout London. Dickens and Kingsley both wrote strongly of the rowdyism and disorder of the house, Kingsley in particular designating the Old Vic in " Alton Locke " as " a hot-bed of crime." It is noteworthy that to-day Charles Kingsley's grandniece, Gabrielle Vallings, is one of the most popular members of the Old Vic Opera Company, and that both she and " Lucas Malet " are two of the keenest admirers of the work.

The ideal which prompted Miss Cons to attempt miracles remains intact to-day. The Vic is not, and never has been, a commercial enterprise. It does not seek to compete with, or outshine, the theatres on the other side of the river; its aim is solely to present beauty, either in operatic or dramatic form, to a public that might otherwise go without any diversion, or be driven to look for stimulation and refreshment, after a long day's work, among the dry bones of a cinema, music hall, or revue. The type of entertainment offered has progressed from variety turns, ballad and symphony concerts, to operatic tableaux (the then existing licence prohibiting the entire performance of an opera); from these to the entire opera; and, finally, in 1914, to the great adventure of a constant Shake-

speare repertory, until the theatre has earned for itself the title, " The Home of Shakespeare and Opera in English," and has also, by giving part of its structure to form the nucleus of Morley College, prepared the way for the modern Polytechnic. This child of the Vic, the forerunner of all Polytechnics and Evening Institutes on the Surrey side of the river, came into being as the result of the early lectures at the Vic, and is housed in the paint-rooms, dressing-rooms, and offices of the original building.

Lectures, illustrated by lantern slides, are still given once a month on Travel, Science, Architecture. A lecture on Carols is given each year early in December. This year Dr. R. R. Terry, the organist of Westminster Cathedral, was the lecturer, and the subject was delightfully illustrated by a male septet from his choir. People left the theatre fully determined, not only to sing carols, but to sing *good* ones in future.

Opera in English is now given on Thursday and Saturday evenings and on alternate Saturday afternoons. For many years it was found that " Faust," " Carmen," " Cavalleria Rusticana," " Pagliacci," " Il Trovatore," " The Bohemian Girl," and " Maritana " were the chief favourites. Later, in 1904, came the first Wagner opera, " Tannhäuser," and after all these years the tremendous ovation at the conclusion of that overture still rings in our ears. The following season we attempted " Lohengrin," and our third Wagner opera, " Tristan and Isolde," was performed last season.

During the last two years we have, with the invaluable assistance of Clive Carey and of Edward J. Dent, who has permitted us to use his librettos, been able to give three of Mozart's delightful operas, " Don Giovanni," " The Marriage of Figaro," and the " Magic Flute." We gave " Don Giovanni " some few years ago, but it did not appear on our programme again until last autumn. The difficulty of casting an opera like " Don Giovanni " is that not only do you want an excellent baritone singer and actor, but at the Vic we must have a man with high ideals, or the opera is too horrible. Always in casting operas and plays the manager has found that one gets the best results for an evil character from the cleanest and noblest people. For instance, in casting the courtesan in " Othello," or " The Comedy of Errors," one would select the most modest girl in the company. Our dear old friend, Ben Greet, who produced Shakespeare for us for several years, was always so furious in the early days when opera filled the house and Shakespeare audiences were still scanty. He would say, in a vexed voice, " There, they'll come for your immoral operas !" We feel strongly that to the uninitiated music awakens the soul.

People who are not alive to the music and melody of beautiful poetry, often after being enthusiastic lovers of opera for a time, suddenly realize the melody of language in the Bible and Shakespeare.

Perhaps the most remarkable feature of the Old Vic's work is that for seven years it has consistently performed Shakespeare. All through the war our boys from the Colonies, the soldiers of France, Serbia, and other Allied countries, found their way to the Vic, to hear Shakespeare in the tongue in which he wrote. A young Serbian doctor staying in London for six months offered to take the chair at a lecture on Serbia, and he told the audience that the Vic had been his English tutor. For two or three nights a week he came to hear the plays previously familiar to him only in his own language.

Before the end of this season we hope to have given our thirty-first Shakespeare play, and, in addition to these, ancient Nativity and Morality Plays (including "Everyman," as strong and uplifting as many a sermon), "The Hope of the World," a modern Christmas play written specially for the Vic by Father Andrew, S.D.C.; and eighteenth-century comedies have been acted. Our producer this season, Robert Atkins, was very anxious to try a play of Strindberg's; so "Advent" was given instead of the usual Nativity Play before Christmas. In honour of the Molière Tercentenary his "Love is the Best Doctor" will be given with "The Comedy of Errors" in April next.

The Vic is also trying, as far as is possible without interfering with the primary demands of the Classics, to give an occasional play or opera by a modern author or composer. Last season we did Nicholas Gatty's musical extravaganza, "Prince Ferelon," and in the November of this year, Halcott Glover's powerful play, "Wat Tyler," which was very well received. We hope to revive Dr. Ethel Smyth's opera, "The Boatswain's Mate," next March, and during the Shakespeare Festival in the following month, Nicholas Gatty's "Tempest," which will be, we believe, the first time an appropriate opera has been given in honour of "Shakespeare's Birthday."

We find that the Nativity and Morality Plays reach a public which does not otherwise come under the influence of religious teaching at all. We have had letters from individuals, and in many cases from missionaries and Rescue and Preventive workers, telling of the turning of whole lives after a visit to the Vic and the witnessing of these plays. Rough girls who have never given a thought to Church have felt that they want to remodel their lives and thoughts, and are stronger for fresh effort to be more like the Holy Mother. The Nativity Plays

have made them love Our Lord's Mother, and not only realize what she was as a young mother, but have started them on the path of study to think about her. It has come home to them what an influence she had on Our Lord in later life. Discussing a Nativity Play, a rough woman said, " Well, you see, she always was His pal. It was she told Him that the guests wanted wine."

With regard to Shakespeare, our most daring experiment, the production of " Pericles," proved that almost everything he wrote, if approached by audience and performers in the right spirit, offers, when regarded as a whole, some lofty teaching, and contains, when listened to line by line, many high thoughts, which, if we will allow them, will bring us nearer God; and the same is true of many of the operas.

After a performance of " Faust " a gang of rough boys and girls were tumbling down the gallery staircase, and a boy pinned one of the girls to the wall in a rough kind of love-making. Another girl who was with them called out, " Now then, Liza, don't forget Mephi's warning to Marguerite: No playing about until the ring is on your finger." After the Pilgrim's chorus during the first performance of " Tannhäuser " a woman said, " I thought my heart would break. I felt if I didn't pray, I'd die," and she had never had the desire to pray before. We know of more than one instance where the Easter hymn in " Cavalleria Rusticana," and the scene between Santuzza and Mother Lucia has helped the soul to realize that one must be in a state of forgiveness before approaching the altar.

Speaking with all humility, and with a very grave sense of its responsibility, the Old Vic feels it shares with the Church the duty of preserving " the tongue that Shakespeare spake," the language that the translators of the Bible used. It is partly for this reason that the plays are this season presented as far as possible in their entirety; not lopped and shorn to fit the capacity of an actor manager, or the ideas of his scenic artists. In order to this do, Robert Atkins, our present producer, has reverted to the use of the " Apron Stage," simplifying the scenery as far as possible by the use of curtains. It was, perhaps, a bold stroke to introduce such methods, but it has been more than justified by the gain in dramatic effect, particularly in the " Tragedies," and by the stark beauty of the verse when it is enhanced by a self-coloured curtain which suggests rather than represents.

The Old Vic audience gains almost as many " Press Notices " as the productions. It is a wonderful audience; the atmosphere in the house can be sensed at once. It would be unbelievable in any other theatre to find a large proportion of the audience

perfectly willing to stand through five hours of "Hamlet" in its entirety, presented as it always is, as near St. George's Day as possible. Last year Shakespeare's Birthday fell on a Saturday, and it was possible for the first time, to give the entire tragedy on the Birthday itself, St. George's Day. "Pericles," produced for the first time last year, would be difficult anywhere else. May it not be that the Old Vic audience, consciously or unconsciously, feels that the Theatre has a high vocation, and that its aim is to give beauty to the world?

The appreciation and enthusiasm of the audience is a byword throughout London, and a substantial reward to the players and management to whom the production of a new play, generally once a fortnight, means incessant work and great strain, for a comparatively small financial remuneration. It is, perhaps, only just that the players should reap benefit in a more concrete sense. As a training-ground for young artists the Vic stands unsurpassed. A number of West End stars have graduated from the cramped inconvenient old playhouse where nothing but "big" work is presented, and not one of them forgets "the most wonderful audience in the world."

The Vic firmly believes that it is a distinct influence for good. Without this conviction, the hard work that it entails would be impossible. It is sufficient to say that it will be a great sorrow if the work comes to an end owing to lack of funds to find Morley College a new home, to extend the space behind the stage, to provide the dressing-rooms, store-rooms, exits and, entrances quite rightly ordered by the London County Council and needed for the accommodation and comfort of the players and staff of the only theatre in the United Kingdom running repertory Shakespeare and opera in English. But to acquire them £30,000 is needed, as Morley College must be provided with a new home. If every man and woman who has benefited by the Polytechnics, Technical Institutes, and evening schools in their fight in life would contribute the sum of 1s., it would go far towards the amount required.

Although the prices of admission at the Vic are lower than at other theatres, the upkeep charges (lighting, heating, etc.) are not lower.

The Vic is able to meet current expenses, but it is not able to pay these new capital charges out of income.

It is difficult to deal with the Vic impersonally when it has been the whole of one's life for nearly twenty-five years, and it is impossible to write of it coherently in the conditions in which we have to work.

If our Appeal is successful, we shall do our work better, and the public will thus reap their reward.

LILIAN BAYLIS.

DR. RASHDALL'S THEORY OF THE ATONEMENT

(A Criticism by an Objectivist.)

(*Continued.*)

If Dr. Rashdall's teaching fails to maintain itself when examined on general lines of criticism it fails still more signally under the test of reason. For here he has made the serious error of mistaking secondary for primary causes—confusing the *conditions* with the *ground* of forgiveness. It by no means follows that even though repentance were "the one condition" necessary for forgiveness that therefore it is the reason why, or the *ground* on which, God forgives penitents. Even if we were to grant that all which St. Paul has taught about faith, and all that can be deduced from the Synoptists and St. John could rightly be set aside, it would still remain to be proved that there is nothing *behind* repentance, no expiatory sacrifice, no act of adequate spiritual reparation, which makes it possible for repentance to be the only condition required by God for forgiveness. The objective view of the Atonement is in no way opposed to our Lord's teaching that repentance is a necessary condition of forgiveness. The disagreement is with Dr. Rashdall's theory, and it only arises when he assumes that this is the *only* ground of forgiveness—a position which he makes no attempt to prove, having overlooked the necessity for doing so. Here he seems to have fallen into a serious logical error which constitutes a grave, if not a fatal, flaw in his theory.

In view of these various considerations the two great basic positions upon which his theory is built up—viz., (1) that the chief part of the New Testament, including the writings of SS. Paul, John, and Peter, owes the objective nature of its teaching on the Atonement to mistaken interpretations of the prophets by the early Church; and (2) that the teaching of our Lord Himself as found in the Synoptists is opposed to any objective theory of the Atonement—both these foundations of his theory are seriously undermined; and, consequently, all the great mass of textual criticism, immense learning, and careful special pleading by which the structure of his argument is built up, becomes useless for the purpose he had in view. It fails either to eliminate the objective idea of the Atonement or to establish his own Abelardian conception.

The same failure attends his attack upon the objective theory from the philosophic position. All through his book we find the mistaken idea that vicarious suffering necessarily

involves unjust punishment—the punishment of the innocent in place of the guilty (pp. 46, 93-9, 187 *et seq.*, 422); and on pp. 423 *et seq.* he raises the further objection that the originally Greek theory that the sinner really suffered the penalty of his sins "because the humanity which was in Christ suffered it," "involves an abuse of the Platonic doctrine of universals. The universal 'humanity' is supposed to have a concrete existence so independent of its individual manifestations that the 'universal' can be credited with the guilt of one of its particulars, and can endure the punishment which all but one of the particulars do not endure, and yet to be so far inseparable from those manifestations that the endurance of the penalty can nevertheless be credited to each and every particular" (p. 424). This is a difficult sentence to analyze, yet perhaps for our purpose it will do justice to Dr. Rashdall's argument if rendered: "The universal (*i.e.*, of humanity) is so independent that the particulars do not suffer with it; and yet so united that they are affected by its sufferings." At any rate this rendering is sufficiently near in meaning to Dr. Rashdall's sentence to enable us to agree with his decision: "It is clear we cannot have it both ways," and that "no juggling with universals will make it true to say that an individual who has in point of fact not been punished may nevertheless be deemed to be punished."

With this we can agree, but would hold that the statement does not represent anything which the objective doctrine necessarily involves, since this rather teaches that the first half of the sentence—whether in Dr. Rashdall's full form or in our simplified rendering of it—is inaccurate, and is better represented by St. Paul's statement, "I am crucified with Christ"—*i.e.*, Christians do suffer with Christ, the Universal of humanity.

Again, when Dr. Rashdall asserts, "A particular man cannot be also a universal," we feel that at the present stage of psychology enough is not known of personality, especially of Divine Personality, to justify so unqualified a statement. One is tempted to retort that, if it be true, it is obvious that a particular man is not capable of knowing what a universal man can do. We feel inclined to challenge the statement all the more strongly when we find an authority writing with regard to Neo-Platonism that "hints of an ultimate solution, of a universal which is at once and *per se* particular, are not wanting."* And when still more recent philosophy teaches that "personality is capacity for fellowship," and that

* *Cf.* Professor R. Adamson, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, vol. xiv., p. 785, ninth edition.

"Divinity is the sum-total of independent, spiritual existence" and is not *a* person but Person, does not this mean that the universal and particulars of personality are no longer necessarily separate from one another? Again, Dr. Relton has said that the problem of the Divine and human nature in Christ "is ultimately unsolvable by any finite mind. It postulates a logical impossibility—the particular cannot embody its own universal. But the Person of Christ is the bankruptcy of human logic."* And Dr. Headlam, commenting on this, says: "It will always be found, as Dr. Mozley once said, that the simplest and most ordinary uneducated conception is more likely to be true than the more philosophical one. For the natural human mind, he argues, is not afraid of inconsistency. It recognizes facts, and is not too anxious to fit them into a theory."

This crowning wisdom which completes the character of the philosophic Christian by bestowing upon him a childlike humility, is required in all the great doctrines of Christianity: in the doctrine of the Atonement no less than in that of the Incarnation. And the reason for this is clear—viz., that in our present material condition we do not possess sufficient data concerning spiritual existence to enable us to apprehend and state the full truth. It is in fact by no means certain that in spiritual existence a state of identification with distinction of personality is not possible. Many would hold that it is probable, and that the development of knowledge is pointing in that direction.

It remains to review some outstanding features of Dr. Rashdall's own theory, and of these the most important is his doctrine of justification by good works (Lecture I., especially pp. 11-24) in opposition to St. Paul's doctrine of Justification by faith. He leads up to this with the statement that he thinks "it cannot be denied that St. Paul does habitually identify faith with intellectual belief" (p. 108), a view which he claims is proved by the instances quoted by St. Paul to illustrate faith in holy men of old—*e.g.*, Abraham. But in view of what his faith meant to Abraham in the surrender of the direction of his whole life to God, this assumption of Dr. Rashdall's cannot be conceded any more than the conclusion he bases upon it—viz., that in his argumentative passages, when St. Paul speaks of Christian justifying faith he only means belief *about* Jesus (pp. 108, 109). For the phrase "to believe in (one's) heart" (Rom. x. 9) which is quoted by Dr. Rashdall in support of this view is, after all, more than mere "intellectual belief," and

* Dr. Relton's recent article in THEOLOGY (November, 1921), which strongly supports the above view, had not been published when this was written.

the decisive reason which led our Lord to accept death was that His Father *willed* Him to do so; and if the results attainable by His death could have been attained in any other way it is difficult to see how this " Will " was justifiable.

A somewhat similar moral difficulty has been raised by Professor Denney, and by the attention he pays it Dr. Rashdall shows that he feels it is not a negligible one (*cf.* pp. 439-443). But it is not quite of the same kind as that suggested here, being concerned with the right of a man to sacrifice himself for insufficient reasons rather than with that of another to will him to do so. In the case of Professor Denny the argument is that unless there was some sufficient reason for his action our Lord would not have been justified in making no effort to avoid death, but in rather seeking to meet it. Dr. Rashdall's argument in reply, that if our Lord had saved Himself by discontinuing to preach it would have stultified His whole life, is of questionable value. For there was a third alternative open which He had already practised—viz., *reculer pour mieux sauter*. According to Dr. Rashdall's own showing, and adopting his own standpoint, our Saviour's chief work of teaching was still very incomplete, so that there was still great need to guard His followers against those mistaken ideas of the early Church which, through SS. Paul and John and other New Testament writers, proved to be the greatest obstacles to the spread of the real truth. Our Lord's death closed all opportunity for further general service of this kind, and we ask, therefore, Why did He choose to die ?

If it be urged in reply that of the two alternatives before Him He preferred the gain of the subjective appeal of His death to that which might result from any additional teaching because He judged it would be more effective for His purpose, that would be to charge Him with preferring emotionalism to moral and spiritual truth as the basis of His religion.

There must, then, have been some other reason; and apparently every other result save that of an adequate expiation for sin could have been attained in other ways. Saints, prophets, and martyrs could have been especially inspired by the Holy Spirit to reveal the truths of God and present examples of how to live and die; and this would in some ways have been done more effectively by mere men than by our Lord, since we would have felt their examples more within our power to imitate than the perfection of the Divine Man. Indeed, real advance had been made by these means before our Saviour's era, and, if all that was needed in order to make His teaching effective was the inspiration of such lives, or the realization of God's love,

it appears that it would have been a more moral method for God to bring this about by a greater outpouring of His Spirit than to plan that men should be permitted to perpetrate an immense crime, and to will that His Son should endure its consequences. This last theory presents great difficulties.

On the other hand, there are reasons which to many appear satisfying for thinking that the requirements of holy justice needed satisfaction, and that only perfect obedience, even to death, and the endurance of sin's penalty could justify forgiveness, and open a way for men back to the Father. And since in all creation these conditions could only be satisfied by His Son, to Whom alone perfect obedience and a nature and position enabling the benefits of His sacrifice to be transmitted to others belonged, this, and this alone, justified the Father in desiring His Son to make the sacrifice asked of Him. At any rate, until it has been demonstrated to be untrue this is a position which can reasonably be held.

If this be the correct view of the mystery of the Atonement, then the Incarnation naturally falls into place as a necessary step in preparation for the sacrifice for sin made upon Calvary and the Cross justifies the Incarnation. But if no expiation nor satisfaction was made there—if our Lord's death was but another and supreme instance of martyrdom—then He did nothing different in kind from what other martyrs for truth have done, and could have been inspired to do instead of Him; and it becomes very difficult in this case to explain why the Father put this unnecessary weight of suffering upon His Son. Only an objective view of the Atonement seems to afford a sufficient explanation of the Incarnation, and any purely subjective theory fails to do so.

The objective theory supplies also a higher standard of ethics than any alternative view, providing a greater manifestation of Divine love, inasmuch as the bearing of the penalty of sin involves a greater sacrifice than any mere death of the body. If our Lord bore upon the Cross in all the darkness of perplexity the penalty which sin demands, He did a much finer thing, and His death of perfect obedience is lifted up to an altogether higher plane in the moral and spiritual sphere than if He died only a martyr's death. Considered as an act in the world drama, it stands on a different and loftier plane than can be accorded it under any purely subjective theory. This latter presents us with the story of a great sacrifice: the objective view with one still greater. And this being so we feel that the latter is more worthy of God. It gives us all that subjective theories do and more. And since God is perfection, this is a strong argument in its favour, and is also perhaps the most

forcible objection to Dr. Rashdall's theory of the Atonement, which, as compared with other views, whether objective or evangelical, is one chiefly of negations. He does not even demonstrate his negations, and in many instances does not claim to have done so. He does, however, claim that they are *probably* true, and may claim to have shown that the case for the objective theory is not proved; which, if taken in the sense of "not logically demonstrated in the manner of a mathematical problem," we shall accept as true. The same is true of Christianity as a whole: its acceptance is a matter of faith, not of logic; of freedom, not of intellectual compulsion. And as far as the probability of his conclusions is concerned, that also, as a matter of mere logic, may be conceded, but with the proviso that it must be remembered that in God's plan of salvation—the Atonement—we are not dealing merely with the humanly probable, but with the divinely possible; and that the former is an infinitely more limited thing than the latter.

The fact is that Modernism aims, not so much at discovering the fullest measure of spiritual truth, as at defining the limits of demonstrable fact—*i.e.*, it seeeks to live as much as possible by logic, and as little as possible by faith. As a result it becomes a new form of anthropomorphism which seeks to limit the Christian creed by the measure of the human understanding; and, as the most recent development of Neo-Platonism, place the soul in subjection to Reason.

In making probability his guiding principle, and refusing to accept anything which is not logically demonstrated, Dr. Rashdall necessarily restricts himself to a more limited faith than is otherwise possible; and, accordingly, that is what we find everywhere in his book—a poorer Gospel. The conclusions of his textual criticism are always those which make leastdemands upon God's love and power; and also least upon men's spiritual efforts and attainments—*i.e.*, provided that we set aside mechanical and immoral ideas of the operation of Christian faith which on serious believer in the objective theory holds nowadays.

But not only is the Bible impoverished. Many familiar expressions of the Prayer-Book under Dr. Rashdall's theory could no longer be used in their natural sense. Consider how it would affect so common a phrase as "for Jesus Christ's sake," or "for His merits' sake." Or, again, "Redeemed by His precious blood," and "Who by Thy Cross and precious Blood hast redeemed us." The mention of faith as a condition of forgiveness would have to be omitted in the absolutions and in the second of the Comfortable Words; and the sentence "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world" from the Prayer of Consecration. The fact that these

words have harmonized with the deepest religious experiences of generations of Christians in itself suggests that their omission would be a doctrinal error due to influences predominantly intellectual rather than spiritual.

If we ask what is the motive which has inspired Dr. Rashdall to all this destructive criticism, it seems clear that it is due to the belief that the objective theory of the Atonement necessarily involves immoral conceptions of God calculated to have a very injurious influence upon Christian morality. He feels that, in addition to going outside the safe field of logic, the doctrine of Justification by Faith encourages carelessness with regard to morals; that substitutionary conceptions necessarily involve injustice; and that the idea of expiation replaces the Christian conception of the God of love by a God of vengeance. It is because of his strong moral sense that he has set himself so thoroughly to demolish the foundations of the objective theory. If only he could have disabused his mind of these mistaken ideas, and understood that in reality the objective theory opens out the loftiest visions of Divine love operating to reconcile—without derogation from either—the requirements of justice and mercy, he would not have wasted his great learning in pulling down ancient idols already disintegrated into dust, but would have rather used it to irradiate those larger truths which we believe are the real needs of the modern mind. Those of us who take this view feel that Christianity will never be content to be restrained within the narrow limits which Modernism offers, and will continue to hold fast the larger views of what God's love has planned, sacrificed, and accomplished for our salvation which are opened out for a reasonable faith to accept by the objective theory of the Atonement. And where we cannot fully apprehend we will still trust as being the attitude of the higher wisdom.

P. L. Snowden.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

Mr. Magor's *apologia*, entitled *A Resurrection of Relics* (Blackwell, 2s. net) reaches us as we go to press, and we propose to comment on it next month, when we hope also to publish a review of Dr. Darragh's book, *The Resurrection of the Flesh* (S.P.C.K., 18s. net).

We have been requested by two or three correspondents recently to give short biographical notes of the writers of articles in each number, as is done in several periodicals. This is not a matter to decide quickly; but we will give the suggestion careful consideration.

The Bishop-Coadjutor of California writes as follows, and at Professor Watson's request we publish the letter:

"*December* 15, 1921.

"I have just been giving belated attention to the October number of Theology. I am wondering whether any one has called your attention, or that of Professor Watson, to the mistake, or perhaps I should call it lack of up-to-date information, which his article on Provinces shows in connection with the Church in America. The only Provincial experiment of which he knows is that made in Illinois a good many years ago. As a matter of fact we have now a Provincial system established by canon and accepted by all the dioceses of the Church. The Church, through the nation, is divided into eight Provinces, each of which has its Synod and a Presiding Bishop who is known as President of the Province. The Synod deals with missionary, educational, and social service work and other common interests of the dioceses composing the Province. In some of the Eastern Provinces a good deal of progress has been made in the maintenance of definite Provincial work. The Provinces constitute intermediate units between the Diocese and General Convention. They have not, however, legislative power. That resides in the Diocese on the one hand, and the General Convention on the other. Deputies to General Convention are chosen directly from the Dioceses. One of the problems facing us at the present time is the development of the Provincial system so that the Provinces may have larger responsibilities in reference to the common work of the Church.

"Perhaps I might add that these Provinces date back in their beginnings somewhat over twenty years to the division of the country into missionary and judicial departments for convenience of work. Courts of Review to which, in some cases, appeal might be made from Diocesan Courts had been found desirable, and the country was divided for the judicial and missionary purposes into eight departments. After very considerable discussion throughout the Church in 1913 these departments were recast into Provinces and given considerably larger authority. They elect, for example, their Courts of Review, a function which I should properly have specified in a previous paragraph.

"I am inclined to think, if I may make one more remark on this article, that most of our American Churchmen would feel that emphasis in America has been upon Diocesan independence (State rights in politics) rather than upon the functions of the national Church. It is only since 1919 that we have had any effective national organization of our work."

PAPERS FOR THE PRIESTHOOD

A.—DEVOTION

By Rev. W. B. Trevelyan, formerly Warden of Liddon House

VIII.—THE PRAYER OF QUIET

If, amongst those who may have read these papers, there are any who have intimate personal knowledge of the subject of mystical theology, they will have realized that the writer has made little, if any, attempt to define or explain in detail the various divisions and subdivisions of prayer given by experts on the subject, but has desired rather to emphasize underlying principles.

There are nowadays many books, large and small, which treat of such matters, written, doubtlessly, by those who have not only an intellectual grasp of the subject, but also the personal experience which alone can make such treatment of any real value.

I. But there is a form of Mystical Prayer which, even in so fragmentary and simple a treatment, seems to demand special notice—namely, the "Prayer of Quiet." Though it is one of the kinds of ordinary prayer, it is regarded as a form of contemplation—in other words, it is supernatural, and divinely given. This will be better understood if we realize that an Act of Contrition, for example, or of the Love of God, is a supernatural act, but not mystical, because the grace to make it is never refused. The Prayer of Quiet, on the other hand, is mystical, because it is wholly dependent on the Will of God, and cannot, like the acts mentioned above, be produced (however feebly) by our own effort.

Father Poulain (*Cath. Ency.*, vol. iv., p. 324) speaks of the Prayer of Quiet as "ordinary prayer," though a higher form of it, and as bordering on the mystical state. This seems to bring it more nearly within reach of those of us who are timid in making prayer-ventures.

This kind of prayer has been well described as "that in which the soul experiences an extraordinary peace and rest, accompanied by delight or pleasure in contemplating God as present." True, this consciousness may be very indistinct or obscure, but as the soul advances in the knowledge of God, it will become clearer. And this consciousness is, as we have seen, the gift of God—a supernatural gift—indeed a special and extraordinary gift of the Spirit of Wisdom: "It is God Himself who makes His Presence felt in the inmost soul."

It is given at first only occasionally, and then only for a few minutes, to those who have made already some progress in the prayer of Recollection and Silence. It may, however, become not only very frequent, but habitual, though even then its strength will vary at different times.

Père Grou (*How to Pray*, edited by Fr. Clarke. Thos. Baker, 1901), urging the value of such wordless prayer, says: "They should beg of the Holy Ghost to teach them; and then at short intervals remain for a few moments in silence before God. They must not be disheartened if they do not at once succeed as they would wish; they must guard against the imagination which rises in rebellion against a manner of praying that it does not take kindly to; and, lastly, they should take to it gradually."

Its spiritual results are described as "interior peace which remains

after the time of prayer, profound humility, aptitude and disposition for spiritual duties, a heavenly light in the intellect, and stability of the will in goodness." It is, we are told, by such fruits as these that true mystics may be distinguished from false ones.

A description of this kind of prayer was given the other day to the writer by a friend who is deeply versed in the subject. "It is," he said in effect, "what a little child feels when lying in his mother's arms —utter safety in being wrapped round, learning, feeding, he knows not how."

It cannot be presumptuous to believe that some share at least in such a spiritual experience may be within the reach of any of us, if only we keep in mind the fact of its "given-ness," and proceed in a spirit of humility and caution. Probably few of us are without some experiences, however few, faint, or far between, of what is described in the passages given above. At the end of a Retreat, for instance, or after a good Communion, or a specially penitent and devout confession, some glimpse at least of these things has been ours. But, as in all else that has to do with the mystical life, should such experiences lead to the abandonment of our ordinary devotions, to neglect of daily prayer, public worship, meditation, and the like, it would be, as Père Grou says, "insufferable pride." Such extravagances are always possible, and at the present time the increased interest taken in psychology too often leads ill-balanced minds into paths dangerous in the highest degree both to themselves and to others.

II. Two warnings may here be briefly given:

(1) Those who are called, or believe themselves to be called, to mystical prayer should take advice from some wise priest before they give up any of their ordinary practices, or adopt new ones. Further, in view of the twofold fact that an increasing number of people are needing this kind of guidance, while there are comparatively few priests who can be considered specialists in such subjects, we should surely pray that God will raise up amongst us more confessors who possess the special experience that is needed.

(2) It should be remembered that for those who are called to mystical prayer there is need of constant watchfulness, great humility, and self-mistrust. Two hundred years ago the religious world in France was torn asunder by the grievous troubles which arose from "Quietism." Even the most devout and learned were, in many cases, almost incredibly misled by it. When it is believed, as it then was by many, that those who have learnt to use supernatural prayer, and to live habitually in the conscious presence of God, are thereby released from all such obligations as daily prayers, meditation, public worship, self-examination, acts of contrition, or the like; when prayer in the sense of petition is looked upon as needless—it is impossible to doubt that this is nothing else than sheer disobedience to the teaching of our Lord and of His Saints in all ages. While the effort to attain a deep sense of God's Presence should be the aim of every Christian, none of us can be justified in "leaving the other undone."

Those who wish for more light on the subject of Quietism and some of its strange developments will find it admirably dealt with in Miss E. K. Sanders' *Study of Bossuet*, recently published.

B.—IN THE STUDY

ADVICE ON BOOKS

If readers who require advice on courses of theological study or the choice of books care to write to the Editorial Department of S.P.C.K., an attempt will be made to give them the required information. Sixpence in stamps should be sent to cover the cost of the necessary correspondence. It will frequently be necessary to refer the enquiry to an expert; a number of well-known scholars have consented to help in this way. Sometimes, especially in the summer months, there may be a little delay in answering. The Editor reserves the right to publish answers if they are of sufficient general interest. In such cases the initials of the correspondents will be given.

D.—CIVIC RELATIONS OF THE MINISTRY

By Miss A. Deane, O.B.E.

VII.—THE QUESTION OF MINIMUM RATES OF WAGES AND THE OPERATION OF TRADE BOARDS

Less than twenty years ago, many of us knew that the words of the "Song of the Shirt" were no fiction of a poet's fevered brain, but sad and literal truth.

> "Oh man with sisters dear! Oh men with mothers and wives,
> It is not linen you're wearing out, but human creatures' lives."

Sweating was a grim and awful fact, an evil in our midst that had to be fought.

The fight is not over, though the principle of a minimum wage has been conceded. Those of us who worked in the early days for the Anti-sweating League and helped with investigations to bring forward evidence that would arouse the public conscience know how fierce and long has been the fight, and we care so much that we feel it imperative that those who are living and working amongst the people who are affected by the operation of Trade Boards should understand how they are established and what are their powers and duties. In the first place a Trade Board is established to regulate wages in industries which have no existing machinery for doing this. It fixes minimum rates of wages which, when they have been confirmed by the Minister of Labour, must be paid by all employers in the trade and are enforced by the law. The first Act was passed in 1909 and the second in 1918.

Before the Minister of Labour makes an order for establishing a Trade Board in any industry, he has to give notice that he intends to do so. This notice is published widely, and a period of forty days is allowed in which objections may be sent to him. These objections must be stated in writing and must state clearly the specific grounds for objection, and must also state any modifications asked for, any additions wanted or any omissions suggested. The Minister must order a public enquiry to consider these before it is decided to establish the Trade Board or not. The actual constitution of the Trade Board is as follows: an equal number of representatives of employers and workpeople in the trade, and in addition two or four persons not connected with trade and an independent chairman.

It will be seen that to have the right people on it in the interests of the trade there should be effective trade organization. The workers as a rule have their Trade Union and can very easily get the right nominations and those that will be acceptable to the whole body of workers in the trade; in some cases Employers' Federations are in the same position and can do likewise; but the extension of the Act to such trades as dressmaking and millinery, the distributive trades and so on, has proved that a large number of employers have not joined any trade organization and that a very large number of workers are still unorganized, especially women workers. In cases of this kind nominations have been made by the Minister from districts where the trade is chiefly carried on. The numbers on these Trade Boards vary. Some are big and have as many as forty-six members, whilst others may have only ten. Women may sit on the Boards, and home workers may be represented as well as other workers. The work that they are bound to do is laid down in the Act. They have to fix a minimum rate or rates of wages for time work; and if no other rate has been fixed, piece workers must be paid at rates sufficient to yield to an ordinary worker at least as much money as the minimum time rate. It should be remembered that a Board can fix different rates for different classes of workers or for different districts, and it can fix rates for learners, and can lay down conditions which will safeguard their being taught the trade, also the rates can be arranged for a certain period only and can be subject to revision at certain specified dates. It gives ample scope for the consideration of every point which may affect the trade.

There is so much misunderstanding in the minds of people with regard to Trade Boards that it will be well to note how the rate is arrived at.

When it is decided to fix or to alter a rate a notice of this is sent to every employer in the trade; here we come across defective trade organization, for it is obvious that these notices have not always reached the employers concerned, but these notices should be sent to all employers in the trade and have to be exhibited in their works, and two months are allowed in which objections may be raised, which are duly considered before the rate is fixed.

When the rate is actually fixed, then the trade is responsible for exhibiting the Trade Board Rates in the factory or workshop, where all can see it, and an employer who does not comply with the law is then liable to prosecution.

It is within the scope of the Act to set up District Trade Committees; it can also deal with such questions as " Waiting Time," Learners' Premiums, Deductions, and Infirm and Injured Workers.

These Boards are meant to deal with general questions affecting the industry.

The rapid establishment of a large number of Trade Boards has met with a certain amount of opposition. It has been claimed that the minimum rate tends to become the maximum: this can be answered by the experience gained in the last few years of the existing Boards, where it has been found that they have raised substantially the wages of the lowest paid workers in the industries concerned and there have been evident signs that they have benefited in the long run—better paid work has increased production.

It is claimed that they operate adversely upon employment and that their inception has led to a large amount of unemployment. This

certainly is not the case with the Boards that were established before the abnormal state of things that we are faced with at the present time; trade depression and the state of exchanges and other causes have all caused unemployment, and at the moment it would be very difficult accurately to estimate the amount of unemployment directly attributable to the operation of the new Trade Boards. There have been difficulties of administration, and there is no doubt defective trade organization; but the principle of a minimum rate below which a worker shall not be asked to work has been established, and nobody will deny that the days have passed when "sweating" can be tolerated.

In all measures of reform we have to legislate against the worst conditions and safeguard the worker against them. That there is no need for the establishment of Trade Boards in any of the industries that have already established effective machinery for the regulation of wages speaks for itself. It is important that those who are daily in contact with the workers in industry should really understand the working of the Trade Boards, their scope, and their possibilities under the Act. The Church should not fall below the State in setting a standard, and all is not yet right. There is still much to be done.

> "Oh man with sisters dear! Oh men with mothers and wives,
> It is not linen you're wearing out, but human creatures' lives."

REVIEWS

NEW LIGHT ON THE SON OF MAN PROBLEM

SEVERAL readers have written to say that my review of von Harnack's *Marcion* in the November number of THEOLOGY was just what they wanted. Emboldened by their encouragement, I now propose to give an account of a recent book which may or may not be important—I have no means of testing its arguments. But it is certainly desirable that English students should know that such books are being written. The book in question is Reitzenstein's work dealing with the Persian doctrine of salvation (*Das Iranische Erlösungsmysterium*, Bonn, 1921). The author is one of the most brilliant living investigators in the field of ancient comparative religion. Like many German specialists he is exceedingly bold, and his conclusions are probably wrong in many directions. But the wonderful ingenuity of his speculations makes him a most stimulating writer. His earlier book on Hellenistic Mystery Religions has had a considerable influence, and recent studies of the early documents of Egyptian monasticism, which he considers to be made up largely of Pythagorean and similar material, will have to be taken seriously.

The new book is exceedingly bad from a technical standpoint. The author apparently collects material and writes a book from it concurrently. It is a task of great difficulty to follow the argument, and I cannot be sure that I do him justice. He assumes that the reader is conversant with the problems of Mandæan religion, to say nothing of Manichæanism. For our purpose it will be best to prefix a brief description of these two religions, before going on to the book itself and the important conclusions which may possibly be drawn from it.*

Recent discoveries in Central Asia have added a number of Persian, middle-Turkish, and Chinese manuscripts to the authorities already existing for Mani and his teachings. They are, however, exceptionally difficult and apparently only confirm what was known already. Mani was born about A.D. 216, and the origin of his doctrines may be assigned to 250 or thereabouts, in Babylonia. The country was then part of the Parthian empire, and Zoroastrianism was the established religion; in Mani's eyes it was corrupt. He taught that there was a series of revelations promulgated by Buddha, Zoroaster, Jesus, and lastly himself. His system was essentially Gnostic,

* The two following paragraphs are based upon the articles on the Manichæan and Mandæan religions in the *Enc. Rel. and Ethics*, by Professor A. A. Bevan and W. Brandt respectively.

but Iranian features were more pronounced than in other Gnostic systems. For our present purposes we mention only a doctrine that the king of the paradises of light produced a being called the Primal Man to contend against Satan. Satan prevailed, but the heavenly powers rescued Primal Man. Then followed creation. Scholars hitherto do not seem to have regarded this doctrine as of central importance.

The Mandæans still existed in Mesopotamia a few years ago, and are interesting as a living relic of a Gnostic sect with Jewish and Christian affinities. Their sacred book is called the *Genza*, and is written in a form of Aramaic which developed in lower Babylonia. This book is a working over of borrowed material and must be used with great caution. "It cannot be doubted that these documents of the *Genza* which speak authoritatively of Mandæan thought and sentiment were composed prior to Mohammed's day." Some elements possibly date back to a time before John the Baptist and the Gospel. Mandæans believe in the Great Life, who called into existence the Second Life, who in his turn created the world. A Manda d'hayyé ("messenger of life," from which word the title of the sect was derived) was created; his task was to see that the First Life was worshipped upon the earth. The first to be deluded by the wicked ones was the son of the first man; and Manda d'hayyé, or his representatives (Hibil, Sitil, Enos—*i.e.*, Abel, Seth, Enosh), must appear to fortify and maintain mankind in the true faith. The Mandæan Enos rests on an identification or fusion of the Old Testament Enosh (Gen. iv. 26) with the Son of Man (Bar-Enash) of Dan. vii. 13. Enos is a rival to Jesus, and dwells in a cloud, with which may be compared the cloud of the Transfiguration and Ascension narratives. The Jewish elements in Mandæanism came in not from the Old Testament directly but from Aramaic sources, including some of a Gnostic character. In comparison with Manichæanism the system is secondary. Both are indebted, however, to the same Parsi sources. From palæographic evidence it appears that none of the literature can be earlier than the first century A.D.

Most Christian scholars accept the position that later Judaism was strongly affected by Persian influences, but this cannot be taken as certain. M. Gaster, in the article "Parsiism in Judaism" in Hastings' *Encyclopædia*, maintains that the Jews scattered throughout the Babylonian Empire far more probably influenced the promoters of Zoroastrianism. Any influence there may have been the other way round was confined to the Midrashim, the popular beliefs. In any case, the dates of Zoroastrian literature are uncertain.

Without this brief sketch of the existing opinions of scholars we might be tempted to give Reitzenstein's theories more credence than they deserve at this stage. But he claims to have evidence at his disposal which was not before earlier investigators, in the shape of Manichæan fragments from Central Asia unpublished as yet owing to the difficulties of the time. He starts from one of these, a liturgical hymn arranged in the form of call and response, which is clearly of Iranian origin, and from which the later accretions can be separated. The God-spirit is asleep and drunk, imprisoned in matter. This spirit is the world-soul—the idea is collective. A messenger is sent to arouse him. This is the Primal Man. Addressing him the bound spirit says: "From the light and of the gods am I, and I have become a stranger to thee; enemies have fallen upon me; by them have I been led down to the dead." A number of similar passages are quoted. The author proceeds to trace this idea of an imprisoned world-soul rescued by a divine being termed Primal Man, or Enos, through the primitive strata of Manichæan and Mandæan literature and in parallel documents, especially the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch, the Hymn of the Soul in the Acts of Thomas, and the Odes of Solomon. The whole complex of ideas is traced to an Iranian belief in a Primal Man which was transplanted to Babylonian soil and there influenced Judaism and ultimately Christianity. Ideas in St. Paul which were formerly thought to be Hellenic are now seen to be Jewish. But they are not organically part of Judaism, to which the belief in immortality in close connection with a divine being "Man" is strange, and are ultimately Iranian. "This *Man* is in Persian the renewer of the world, bearer of God's message and power, the Saviour for the whole race, but at the same time the *saved*, who is allowed to return to heaven as a first being of light, a god, and at the same time the ideal representative of souls, the great soul." This is not a Messianic idea such as arises in many peoples: it goes far beyond national hopes. Ordinary designations are avoided and secret ones take their place. The part played by Son of Man (*i.e.*, "Man") in Jewish eschatology cannot be explained from Judaism itself. The difficulties in the way of supposing these ideas to have come from Judaism into the Manichæan and Mandæan religions are insuperable. Many other eschatological traits, especially in Enoch and Esdras, are of Iranian origin.

We now summarize the really important part of the book, drawing also upon Reitzenstein's recent article on the same subject in the *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*. Bousset (*Kyrios Christos*, p. 10) had already seen that Son of Man meant a transcendental Messiah, and therefore concluded

that it must spring from the early Church and could not have been a designation used by Jesus of Himself. In this he is wrong. The two titles of Messiah and Son of Man are already in Enoch; they coalesce in Christianity. But they spring from different circles. "It is thoroughly intelligible to me that Barnasha was really the self-designation of Jesus, and that from the belief in the Barnasha belief in the Christos Jesus as the Barnasha exalted to God has arisen. I could not conceive how the Barnasha-confession could arise out of the Christ belief, and the story of Peter's confession (Mark viii. 27; Matt. xvi. 13), so important for the original gospel, would be meaningless and even as an invocation unintelligible. I should like to go further. With Wellhausen I can only understand the belief of the disciples in the Risen [Lord], if the Living [Lord] had already been for them not a mere man but something higher."

This, then, seems to be the author's position. The disciples, as a result of the Baptist's predictions, their own experiences, and the explicit claim of Jesus shown by His assuming the eschatological title, accepted Him as a divine Being appearing on earth to save. The significance of St. Peter's confession was other than is commonly assumed. "Who do men say that the Son of Man is?" The answer shows that according to the popular view He was a prophet *redivivus*. "But who say ye that I am?" "Thou art the Christ." Starting from a belief, naturally to a large extent formless, in a heavenly Man such as was expected in neighbouring countries and had been depicted in the popular eschatological literature, St. Peter crystallizes the thoughts of the disciples' hearts and confesses that Jesus is also the Messianic king foretold by the prophets.

Such is the thesis. I make three comments upon it.

1. The book cannot be regarded as more than a scouting expedition in an unknown country. In so far as the argument rests upon Reitzenstein's conviction that Manichæan and Mandæan sources, which themselves cannot be earlier than the third century A.D., contain elements of a system far anterior to this date, it is hazardous and subjective in the extreme. But it can truly be claimed that modern research tends to make the beginnings of Gnosticism pre-Christian. It may well be that future investigation may support Reitzenstein's theory; on the evidence before us it cannot be more than a brilliant guess. And in any case the bearing of the non-Jewish evidence upon New Testament problems is exaggerated greatly.

2. But even a wrong or disproportionately developed theory is useful, if only as a working hypothesis. Let each reader look at the passages in which "Son of Man" occurs and ask himself their meaning if the theory were proved true.

3. It is well to be reminded that theology is in a state of flux. The current continues to flow away from the liberal humanitarian Jesus, as depicted by nineteenth-century scholars. Schweitzer used eschatology as the key to unlock all problems. Reitzenstein goes further, and sees Jesus consciously fitting Himself into a mythological framework, and playing the central part in a drama of cosmic significance which re-enacted the heavenly drama of the first ages. He approaches the problem from a purely "philological"* standpoint. There is nothing in the book to show that he even envisages the problem whether or not Jesus was justified in claiming to be the heavenly Man. But the very fact that such a book can be written is of immense importance to us in England just now. Current attempts to bring Christology into line with modern thought are clearly hopeless. The thought which is accepted as the standard is already becoming old-fashioned. God forbid that we should grasp at Reitzenstein's theory and use it as a prop, likely to break in our hands, of the Church's traditional faith! But let it at least teach us to suspend our judgment and move very slowly indeed, if at all, in our Christology.

In two important respects Reitzenstein's book justifies a conservative position. Whatever view Our Lord held of His mission and personality He held from the beginning of the gospel record; there is no evidence of any psychological development of Messianic consciousness, so dear to modern writers, during the ministry. And the Hellenistic Church, in worshipping Jesus as Lord, made no advance beyond the standpoint of the earliest days of the Church at Jerusalem.

W. K. Lowther Clarke.

SOME MODERN SETTINGS OF THE OFFICE FOR THE HOLY COMMUNION.

(A) To be Sung by the Choir.

1. In the key of C, by John Ireland. Novello.
2. In the key of D, by E. C. Bairstow. Novello.
3. In the key of A, by Harold Rhodes. Novello.
4. In the Phrygian or Third Mode, by Charles Wood. Faith Press.
5. In the Phrygian or Third Mode, by Henry Ley. Faith Press.

1. Mr. Ireland's service should be a great boon to church choirs. It is not difficult, it is extremely effective when sung

* He uses this word by contrast with "theological," but in a sense rather wider than is usual in English.

by a small choir, and it is ecclesiastical in style. The composer's sense of verbal accent is hardly ever at fault; this is especially noticeable in the Kyrie, where he successfully avoids laying stress on the second syllable of the word "upon"—a snare which has trapped many composers. The Creed is one of the shortest there is, but expressiveness and solemnity are never wanting, and if the Creed is ever to be sung to a "setting" rather than to a simple melody in which everyone can join, one could not wish for anything better than this. The Sanctus, Benedictus, and Agnus Dei all have the great merit of brevity; the latter, with short solos for treble and bass, makes use of a dropping seventh which is curiously beautiful.

The opening and closing sections of the Gloria are extremely exultant, even daringly so, and the middle section, mostly for unaccompanied quartet, is restrained and severe, with a strong flavour of the Elizabethans about it.

2. Dr. Bairstow's setting is of considerable length and complexity; in fact, it is very possibly the most elaborate and difficult setting that has been written for the Anglican service. Only the finest choirs could make anything of it; but given a large and first-rate body of singers and a fine modern organ (and organist), there is much magnificent music to be found in these pages. Dr. Bairstow, as is only natural, writes with a profound knowledge of choral and organ effects, and such a passage as the piled-up climax at "sitteth on the right hand of the Father" would sound thrilling when adequately performed. Very effective and impressive, too, is his reference, at the words "For Thou only art holy" to the phrase on which the Sanctus is built.

3. Mr. Rhodes has written a service which is essentially modern in spirit, and which is much more within the capacity of the average good choir than Dr. Bairstow's, though it is far from being easy. A fine organ is again presupposed. We cannot help feeling that the Benedictus and Agnus Dei err on the side of length; the latter takes nearly four minutes to sing. But there is much fine music in these pages, and the organ part is well written and looks like organ music, not a succession of dull minim-chords, like so many organ parts that one sees.

4. Dr. Wood's service is entirely different from any of the foregoing. He provides no new setting for the Creed, but the old traditional melody is given. Everything else is for unaccompanied voices in four parts. It is strictly modal, and the effect of the simple, beautifully written polyphony is to give an austere calm, belonging almost to another world. Here, it seems to us, is the true spirit of worship expressed in music; here is expressed the sense of mystery, the sense of "humble

access," the sense of awe and reverence in approaching the Holy Mysteries.

This setting is not at all difficult, though a well-balanced choir is needed, and one that can sing absolutely in tune.

5. Dr. Ley's service is on similar lines to Dr. Wood's, and the above remarks apply equally well to it. In the Agnus Dei a particularly beautiful effect is obtained by giving the first half of each petition to the boys' voices alone without accompaniment. We have learnt from the Plainsong revival what an ethereal, other-worldly result can be obtained by this simple means, and Dr. Ley is fully justified in using it. The traditional melody for the Creed is also given here, and both this setting and Dr. Wood's give the threefold Kyrie as well as the response to the Commandments.

(B) To be Sung by the Congregation.

1. A Modal Setting, by Martin Shaw.
2. An Anglican Folk-Mass, by Martin Shaw.
3. A Parish Communion Service, by Martin Shaw.
4. A Communion Service in Modal Style, by C. E. Hoyland.
5. Short and Easy Setting in E flat, by Basil Harwood.
6. Short and Easy Setting in A, by C. V. Stanford.
7. Short and Easy Setting in G, by S. H. Nicholson.

It is very delightful to see some of our foremost composers writing music for the congregation as distinct from the choir, and the revival of congregational singing is one of the most hopeful signs of our Church life to-day. It has been well said that the heartiness or otherwise of a congregation's singing is a very good index of the vitality of a church.

Here, at any rate, are seven settings of the Communion Service which are at once musical, dignified, and ecclesiastical in style, melodious and easy to learn, and well within the capacity of the ordinary congregation. Further, the organ part is in all cases quite simple and does not require a large organ or an organist of great technical skill to make it effective in performance.

1. This is a setting in free chant form; it can be sung in unison or harmony as required.

2 and 3. These are rather in the style of Merbecke; they are written in the old square-note notation, which has been found by experience to be extremely easy for a congregation to follow. No. 2 makes use of certain traditional English melodies. Both of them can be sung entirely in unison, but certain parts can be sung in harmony if required. They fulfil their purpose admirably, and are already widely known and used.

4. This is an interesting experiment in modern Plainsong. It does not, like the previous three settings, adhere to the one note one syllable rule, but is at times rather florid. This is no disadvantage, for it has been found that congregations readily pick up simple melodies of this kind. This setting should find favour in many churches.

5. Dr. Harwood's setting is more after the style of the ordinary Anglican service than any of the foregoing. Much of it is in four-part harmony, but it can be sung in unison or by trebles only, if preferred. It is quite easy, and is the kind of thing for a church to introduce where hitherto the choir have monopolized matters, and where it is desired to encourage the people to sing, inasmuch as the style would not be too violent a contrast to what had been heard before.

6. Sir Charles Stanford's service is entirely in unison, is very easy and melodious and altogether suitable for its purpose. It shows that consummate ease and mastery of technique which one is accustomed to find in this composer's work.

7. The remarks made concerning Dr. Harwood's service might apply equally well to Mr. Nicholson's. It, again, has portions written in harmony, but can be sung in unison throughout.

All the above settings include the Benedictus and Agnus Dei, except No. 6, while Dr. Harwood's and Mr. Hoyland's include the threefold Kyrie as well as the Responses to the Commandments. I think that, on the whole, Nos. 1–4 of the above would prove to be the easiest for a congregation to learn, and to sing by themselves in cases where no choir at all is available. They are in free rhythm, and my experience is that congregations pick up music more easily where they have not got to count so many beats to a bar.

C. Hylton Stewart, Jun.

Is Christianity the Final Religion? A Candid Enquiry with the Materials for an Opinion. By Alan Coates Bouquet, B.D. Formerly a Scholar of Trinity and a Lady Kay Scholar of Jesus College, Cambridge. Pp. x + 350. Macmillan and Co., London. 10s. net.

Two impulses shared in the construction of this interesting book: first, the wish to examine and to defend the idea of an absolute religion; secondly, the desire to show how Christianity alone is fitted to represent that idea in actualization. And this, at least, may be said in praise of Mr. Bouquet's work, that it is an attempt to deal with apologetic at its deepest; the time for "timid and defensive apologetic" is, as the author truly sees, past. And whether the arguments put forward by Mr.

Bouquet, with considerable indebtedness to Troeltsch, are adequate or not, it is certain that he is right, and that others will be right, in trying to explain why for our European civilization religion has no future except as Christianity.

But these last words which loosely, though not inaccurately, reproduce Troeltsch's thought in a long quotation given by Mr. Bouquet bring me to two points of criticism which may be brought against Troeltsch and his English exponent respectively. Troeltsch certainly maintains the absoluteness of that "personalistic redemption religion" which has reached its climax in Christianity, and does not conceive of any further stage in which this type of religion will be transcended. On the other hand, he does not appear to be able to maintain more than a relative absoluteness for the Person of Jesus. That Person is central for that vision of the kingdom of God which has been the spiritual inspiration of one circle of existence; it is through Jesus that this world hitherto has had the truest, and an essentially true, access to God. But that, in Mr. Bouquet's words, Jesus "*was* the Gospel," and that this Gospel is, in the strictest sense, unsurpassable and eternal, Troeltsch does not show. Mr. Bouquet rightly prefers Wendland's statement of the intimate conjunction of "the absolute God and the absolute goal, the kingdom of God . . . with their realization in Jesus."

Where Mr. Bouquet's own handling of his subject seems unsatisfactory, or in need of some readjustment, is in method. Religion, for him, means that view of existence and its values which he calls "personalism." That Christianity is wholly consonant with this view is certainly the case: what is not so clear is that, apart from Christianity, personalism is emerging victorious from the conflict with impersonal monism. Doubtless, as Mr. Bouquet suggests, Naecker is of no account, but there are reasons enough for making one hesitate to speak of "victory" in connection with the combat between personalism and anti-personalistic tendencies. Similarly, as to the possibility of an absolute religion already existing, how far can such a question be put in abstraction from those religious experiences which have stimulated men to religious constructions and so to the formation of ideas about religion? Or, if put, how far can it hope for a convincing answer? There may have been reasons which appeared to force Mr. Bouquet to adopt the method of this book; but, in consequence, he has not made it clear that the practical interest of the idea of an absolute religion and the possibility of grasping the idea are so closely linked up with the Person of Christ, that the best way of attending to the absoluteness of the one is by attending

to the absoluteness of the other. That is where, despite his shortcomings when he writes of the doctrine of the Incarnation and of the Catholic sacramental system, Mr. Glover is profoundly right. Had Mr. Bouquet seized on the idea of absoluteness as something which is given within the Christian experience he would not, perhaps, have been content, in his last chapter, to link on views concerning conduct, atonement, the Church, and the future life, as consequences of the belief in the absoluteness of Christianity. Not that it is untrue to say, "if Christianity is the absolute religion such and such consequences in respect of atonement and immortality follow," but it would be truer to say and show that in them the absoluteness of Christianity is manifested.

There is much more in the book to interest the reader, including an excellent appendix on Theosophy. If Mr. Bouquet is not always on the right road he is exploring an important piece of country, too long left untravelled in England.

J. K. Mozley.

NOTICES

Materials for the Study of the Apostolic Gnosis: Part I. By Thomas Simcox Lea, D.D., Vicar of St. Austell, and Frederick Bligh Bond, F.R.I.B.A. Blackwell, Oxford. 15s. net.

A book such as this helps us to realize one special element of the debt we owe to those innovators of the thirteenth century who taught us the use of what we call the Arabic numerals. Not only have time and space been saved by such a substitution as 8 for viii or 1922 for mdccccxxii, not only have the arithmetical processes of addition and the rest been astonishingly simplified, but the modern mind has been released from a peculiar temptation which beset some of the ancients. When, as in the Hebrew and Greek alphabets, every letter had the signification of a number, it was inevitable that words and especially personal names should suggest a meaning which came neither from derivation nor from usage. A patristic example will illustrate the point. To the Greek eye ΑΔΑΜ was not merely four letters, but four numbers—namely, 1, 4, 1, 40. These by addition made 46. There was a passage in the Gospel bearing on the Resurrection which ran: "Forty and six years was this temple in building." Why this "forty and six"? "This spake He of His body": for was He not the Second Adam?

This play on letter-numbers was still intelligible to those who used the Latin alphabet and the "Roman numerals": for though the Latin system did not run through the alphabet from first to last, yet it did indicate numbers by letters; and on medieval monuments we sometimes see certain letters of the inscription carved on a larger scale, so that when taken together they give a date. But the Arabic numerals and the decimal notation effectually closed the door against the ancient *gnosis* founded on the equivalence of letters and numbers. Indeed, it has become so unfamiliar that the mere suggestion of it only raises a smile. Yet it may fairly be asked whether in earlier days and to those for whom

letters did mean numbers this equivalence may not have had a very serious import; whether even the method of Divine revelation may not have included it as an occasional vehicle of mysterious knowledge. This book, *The Apostolic Gnosis*, answers the question with a bold affirmative.

The rabbinical name for the interpretation of words by numbers, and *vice versa*, was *Gematria*, a corruption of *Geometria*, used erroneously for *Arithmetica*. Our authors refer in passing to an early Christian example of its use, the explanation given in the Epistle of Barnabas of the number of Abraham's servants. In Greek 318 appears as TIH (300+10+8). IH, says Barnabas, stands for IHΣOΥΣ, and T by its shape signifies the Cross. This is part of the rabbinism which characterizes this interesting epistle. For this particular problem was not new: 318 is the sum of the Hebrew letters of Eliezer, the chief of Abraham's servants, and some rabbinic interpreters held that this numerical equivalence decided Abraham's choice of the number of those whom he led to the rescue of Lot. Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* vi. 11), borrows the interpretation of Barnabas and adds that some held Abraham's victory to have been due to his recognition of the Name and the Cross of the Saviour. But he seems to prefer a more purely arithmetical treatment of the numbers: 300 being the Triad in the Hecatontad, 10 the all-perfect Decad, and 8 the first cube. He lets the *gematria* go, and dwells on the value of the numbers as such and not on their equivalence with letters and words. This was natural to a mind which was Alexandrine and not rabbinic.

That the book before us is entitled *The Apostolic Gnosis* (on the ground of a supposed discovery that the New Testament is permeated by the principles of *gematria*) is perhaps due to a misunderstanding. It is true that Barnabas speaks of the interpretation above mentioned as *gnosis*; but this is the word that he constantly uses for the deeper significance of the Scriptures. And our authors fail to show, though they speak as if it were an assured fact, that the Gnostics, as we call them, while inheriting a Pythagorean interest in numbers as such, ever made use of *gematria*. Reference is made to two Gnostic works of considerable dimensions, which are, it would seem, the *Pistis Sophia* and the *Book of Jeu*. But, though we find in these some mention of numbers, there seems to be no *gematria*. The *Book of Jeu* has a series of mystical names followed by numbers; but there is no correspondence between the numbers and the sum of the letters of these names. Indeed, we may question how far *gematria* is ever employed apart from rabbinic influence.

We have, of course, in the New Testament the solitary instance of the Number of the Beast. Here Hebraic influence is obviously at work. The Greek interpreters were fairly puzzled: ΛΑΤΕΙΝΟΣ and TEITAN were the favourites and remained very unconvincing. It is only the Hebrew transliteration of NEPΩN KAIΣAP that will give 666. The best that our authors can provide is the impossible spelling NEPΩN KAEΣAP, which gives 1332, the double of 666. They are on better ground in recalling the suggestion that a clue is to be found in the equivalence of IHΣOΥΣ with the number 888. If this had been noted in early days, we could imagine that a contrast was intended between a number that fell short of the perfect seven and a number which significantly transcended it. But the plausibility of such a suggestion must depend on the establishment of the use of *gematria* elsewhere in the Apostolic writings.

What kind of proof is offered of such use? Here is an example. Passing from the discussion of the Number of the Beast our authors take

us to the Man of Sin and seek to identify by means of *gematria* the person spoken of as ὁ κατεχων, "he that hindereth," in 2 Thess. ii. 7. "The Holy Names of the ΙΗΣΟΥΣ series are all built upon the number Thirty-seven, elsewhere shown to be a geometrical number, as well as one of those of the solar astronomical symbolism. Now it so happens that the word ΚΑΤΕΧΩΝ has the *gematria* value 1776, which is 888+888, the double of ΙΗΣΟΥΣ, and stands for other titles of Christ, such as "The Salvation of Israel"—Η ΣΩΤΗΡΙΑ ΙΣΡΑΗΛ. It is somewhat disconcerting at the outset that κατέχων without the definite article is merely a participle and cannot indicate a particular person. But our authors are not deterred by such a consideration. They introduce to us Narcissus, a freedman of the Emperor Claudius, Nero's predecessor. That this Narcissus was a Christian and that "Cæsar's household" may have had a restraining influence in the early days of Nero's reign is a fair enough conjecture in the field of history. But it is shown to be more than a conjecture: "for ΝΑΡΚΙΣΣΟΣ=851=37×23, and this equates with that epithet applied to Jesus Christ, our 'substance' or 'possession'—Hyparxis (ΥΠΑΡΞΙΣ)." No reference is given us for this "epithet"; and the only occurrence of the word in the New Testament is in Heb. x. 34: "Ye took joyfully the spoiling of your goods (τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ὑμῶν), knowing that ye have yourselves a better and an enduring possession (ὕπαρξιν)." But there is more. "ΚΛΑΥΔΙΟΣ ΝΑΡΚΙΣΣΟΣ ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΕΥΣ = 2886 = ΧΡΗΣΤΟΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ (37×78)." And again, "ΝΑΡΚΙΣΣΟΣ ΚΑΤΕΧΩΝ=2627 (37×71)=ΙΧΘΥΣ ΣΩΤΗΡ=ΤΟ ΕΥΑΓΓΕΛΙΟΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ." And once more, "ΝΑΡΚΙΣΣΟΣ ΚΑΤΕΧΩΝ ΚΑΙΣΑΡΑ=2960 (37×80)=1480+1480, a double Christus (ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΣ)=ΥΙΟΣ ΤΟΥ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ=Son of Man—this is what Jesus Christ called Himself=Ο ΚΥΡΙΟΣ, Ο ΡΥΟΜΕΝΟΣ ΕΚ ΣΙΩΝ." It is perhaps useless to protest that υἱος τοῦ ἀνθρώπου without the article is not Greek and is not a title of Christ.

We have taken this book seriously, because it is significant of our time. There is a restlessness amongst us which is not content with the plain faith of our fathers, corroborated by results. New and startling proofs are sought by some who fear that the Ark of God is trembling and in need of fresh support. But neither colloquies with the departed nor this belated application of the rabbinic *gematria* to the words and letters of the Sacred Book will ease the burden that is laid upon our faith to-day.

ALCHEMY: ITS SCIENCE AND ROMANCE. By the Right Rev. J. E. Mercer, D.D. With four illustrations. S.P.C.K. London. 1921. iv+245. 9s.

It is very fitting that an Anglican Bishop should have written an *apologia* for Alchemy. In days gone by the art appealed strongly to the learned and spiritually minded Churchman; and many secular clergy, including dignitaries, as well as many "religious," including superiors (among others our great Englishman, Roger Bacon), were among its adherents. Two Popes, at the least, were alchemists, and so too were Albertus Magnus, Bishop of Ratisbon, and St. Thomas Aquinas. But Bishop Mercer himself does not profess to be an alchemist even in its modern sense, though he has not failed to tell, with great sympathy, of all the scientific discoveries of Alchemy, and also much of the romance of its history, while at the same time not omitting to point out with fairness its limitations. Alchemy is the mother of modern chemistry;

but it is much more than that: it is a branch of hermetic religious philosophy. The alchemists were a mystic order, with a symbolic language of their own, with spiritual *arcana* withheld from the uninitiated, with a scientific and severe mental disciplinary training for their members. The Bishop quotes various extracts from old alchemical writers and regards them as "unintelligible," "vague and illusive," "very puzzling," "antithetic rigmarole," "a farrago of nonsense," "passing the wit of man to interpret." Yet to the initiate they convey excellent sense and enshrine the deepest spiritual and philosophical truths. The really religious alchemists of the past were a body of men who began the practice of the devout life where the majority of mankind leave off: they aimed at being an upper school of the Holy Ghost; and to reach the top of their ladder with its twelve steps (calcination, dissolution, conjunction, putrefaction, congelation, etc.) meant not only the attainment of the Philosopher's Stone but also the divine gift of spiritual fecundity. Some of the hierophants of Alchemy were among the great Masters of the Spiritual Life: they had transmuted their own base metal into gold, and they also possessed the priceless power of being able to tinge others with the true metal.

Bishop Mercer has done really valuable service in bringing the subject of Alchemy to the notice of Churchpeople to-day. For when the enormous difficulties of its "jargon" have been penetrated, its secrets are found to contain, among many other valuable things, the most exact and scientific description of the various stages in the Interior Life on the Mystic Path that have ever been penned.

HERBERT PENTIN.

FIFTY SPIRITUAL HOMILIES OF ST. MACARIUS THE EGYPTIAN. By A. J. Mason, D.D. S.P.C.K. London. 1921. xliv+316 pp. 15s. net.

It has long been a black mark against the S.P.C.K. that, among all its multitudinous publications, its issue of books by the devotional geniuses of the Catholic Church—the Mystics—could be wellnigh counted on the fingers of two hands. But the Society is mending its ways, though very tardily. Christian Mysticism is "in the air." People are asking for, and obtaining from other publishers, not the second or third rate books of devotion, but the very pearls of Christendom. The series, the "Translations of Christian Literature," is, for the followers of the Inner Path, the best thing that the S.P.C.K. has undertaken for many a long day. Therein, some of the writings of Clement of Alexandria, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Augustine, "Dionysius the Areopagite," and St. Bernard, among other outstanding worthies, appear in an English dress. The latest volume of the series is an able translation, by Canon Mason, of *Fifty Spiritual Homilies of St. Macarius the Egyptian*. Macarius was a Mystic, and his spiritual conversations are mystical, although the word "mystical" rarely occurs in them. The book has been compared, unwisely, with the *Imitation of Christ*, and it suffers by the comparison. The Homilies of St. Macarius are rousing "mission sermons" to the unconverted, or to the lukewarm who are content to rest on low spiritual levels. "Most men wish to obtain the Kingdom without trouble, or pains, or sweats, and that is a thing impossible." "To wrestle against sin, to fight against it, to give and receive blows, is thine; to uproot it is God's." "The enjoyment of God is insatiable. The more anyone tastes and eats of Him, the more he hungers." To arouse men from spiritual, or rather unspiritual, lethargy is the object of this Egyptian *abbas*, and few can read his Homilies without being made gently, though thoroughly, ashamed of themselves, without perceiving how small a

distance they have advanced along the Path to God, and without being braced up and helped to better things.

The book is expensive, but it is well worth its price, and Canon Mason's Introduction is well worthy of the book. HERBERT PENTIN.

THE PILGRIM IN JERUSALEM. By the Rev. O. H. Parry, M.A. With maps and plans and twenty-four illustrations by the Author. S.P.C.K. 1920. 10s. net.

The Bishop of Guiana was in Jerusalem during the year 1918, and, though engaged in important work at St. George's Cathedral, found time to make the exquisite drawings now reproduced and to prepare a guidebook, both learned and thoughtful, which is, we venture to assert, of inestimable value to future Pilgrims in Jerusalem. It is rich in detail. Those who have visited Jerusalem most earnestly will find here a precious memorial of the city and of its treasures.

During the first year of the Allied occupation of Jerusalem, many Englishmen there must have had an uneasy sense that they were enjoying the unique charm of the place without learning enough of its monuments and history. It was difficult not to be content with the mere presence of the lovely place; the grandeur of its Saracen walls, the fascination of its Saracen streets and houses; the amazing lights and colours of those climbing lanes with their sudden vista of sky and mountain; their slippery steps thronged by men, women, and children of twenty races, or blocked by some kneeling camel whose load of hay touched the strange pouts on either side; the valleys now scarred and gaunt, now veiled with the beauty of growth.

Other places are charming, and charm as much as does Jerusalem. But Jerusalem has, nevertheless, an *incomparable* charm, for it has a charm entirely its own; and this in addition to the unspeakable dignity of its associations and its past. Even if it were not what it is, still Jerusalem would defeat Cairo as an Eastern city. It defeats Damascus as a Syrian city. Nothing in your dreams ever approached its inexhaustible interest and variety, its homeliness, its improbability, its impossible combination of a hundred different aspects of the endlessly various creature, Man. It is Saracen, as was said, in actual outline. It is Syrian in air and manner. It is intensely Greek, intensely Catholic. The Armenian, the Copt, the Abyssinian are at home there. The English soldier in those streets and on those roofs was completely in the picture. The Arab of the desert wears here his desert dress, and jostles his Palestinian brother and the turbaned peasant of Galilee or Judæa. The grave Indian finds here his shrine of pilgrimage as well. Jerusalem has been a city of Egyptian-Arab Sultans, themselves restorers of an Egyptian rule older far than David. It is the city of David, of Mary, of our salvation. All the spirit of the Old Testament is here, and all the spirit of the first Church; and "the monks of the imperial race" are here at home, and fill again the palaces where crusading kings ruled and prayed. It is quite impossible to express the delight and interest which every day came home to the uncritical sojourner who, quite unlearnedly, went about this place at his duty or for his recreation. But we felt we ought to find out a little about it; to match its great places with the Bible texts; to get some dates, and a glimpse of a sequence; and perhaps some criticism too, some notion of our right to be reverent and thankful in this place and in that.

Only, somehow, the charm was always too great; and there was no

time for the books; and we must simply wander and enjoy; and we were too utterly at home to stand off at a distance and discuss the Holy City.

This homeliness is peculiar in the East to Palestine. The Eastern parts of Cairo are entrancing, and who is not wrapped in dreams by the Nile and the Desert? But that—down there in Cairo—is the charm of a trance. We know we shall wake from it, as that Eastern Christopher Sly woke from the flattering mystifications of the Commander of the Faithful. From Palestine, from Jerusalem, you do not fear to wake. You are wide awake already, in a clear and most familiar world. In Egypt is the golden glow of a magic evening, full of the thrum of strange harmonies, the scents of mystery. In Palestine is the blue and white of morning by a breezy sea, with flowers, and the song of birds. In Egypt you are in a story of the Arabian Nights. In Palestine and in Jerusalem you have come to the Psalms, and find the Psalms an English book, David almost an English king. You are in the past, and it is your own past, the past of childhood's lessons on a Sunday, the past of your romantic adoration of England. Where you explore, so unlearnedly, the footprints of the unspeakable Majesty, your fathers explored before you, not more learnedly. You find a Daubeny buried before the glorious south front of the Church of the Resurrection; you see, near the Dominicans' historic convent of St. Stephen—with its Eudocian pavements and its tombs of the first Christianity, its modern scholars of exegesis and criticism—the place where Edgar Atheling camped on the first crusade. And you know that your tiny collection of dates and names enables you only to perch here and there upon a lighted point in an immense, and at every stage most momentous, history.

So we walked among the churches old and less old; or returned again and again to the fairest town-space in all the world, the vast area of the Temple; and many of us were profoundly satisfied by that sleek Dome of the Rock which to some is inhuman and self-contained, but to me seems a thing of prayer, just keeping foot on earth, and ready to rise into the skies.

We were, I say, delighted and content, and too busy to be curious, and yet uneasy that we did not know a little about Jerusalem.

And there *was* a man at St. George's who had all our spontaneous happiness and more than all our religious veneration, and yet had read the books, and learned the plans, and ranged the dates, and even criticized the identifications; a man who *knew*, and could tell why things and places had the splendid names they bore.

Some soldiers this good clergyman led round the Church of the Holy Sepulchre; and taught them what to venerate and why and how. He said with them the Prayer for Easter at the Tomb, the Prayer for Victory at the Cross. The rest of us—officers, administrators or what not—could not get into those useful parties. And to us, and to all other English readers, the Bishop has given, to make up, this admirable book which, like his drawings, combines almost the preciseness of a scientific teacher and the passion of a soul most sensitive to all beauty and all sacredness.

Let it be added that we have here a very sufficient discussion of the authenticity of the sacred sites, especially of the Anastasis; and *suggestions* for a study of the relation between all local sacredness taken together and the heart of our faith and worship. But these suggestions open problems which need, for some of us, long and patient reflection, and upon which only two sorts of people can easily make up their minds—the unusually wise, and the unusually foolish.

P. N. Waggett.

THE LIFE OF GOETHE. By P. Hume Brown, F.B.A., LL.D. With a Prefatory Note by Viscount Haldane. 2 vols. Murray. 36s. net. 799 pages.

This biography of Goethe is the best and most complete account of him that has ever appeared in England. For fourteen years, as Lord Haldane tells us in his Prefatory Note, he and the late Professor Hume Brown had made an annual visit to Germany in order to collect materials for it, and the first part of it appeared in 1913, under the title *The Youth of Goethe*. Professor Hume Brown, however, died in 1918, before the rest of the book was in print; but he left it ready for the press, with the exception of a chapter on the second part of "Faust," which has been added since by Lord Haldane.

The result is a most exhaustive account of Goethe's life, and a very able analysis of his works. It must, however, be said that it presents us with a very stiff and ceremonious picture of the great man, in which Goethe never for a moment appears in undress—a real *portrait de parade*. Lewes's *Life* is much less learned, but it is not only far more amusing to read, but also gives us a more living presentation of the man as he was, in his salad days, in his wanderings with Duke Carl August, in the practical jokes which he loved as a young man—the account of all of which in Professor Hume Brown's pages is solemn almost to pomposity. The same criticism applies to his treatment of Goethe's love affairs, which must surely have had a more spontaneous character than one would guess from the way in which they are related by the professor. The fact that the whole episode of "Lucinda" in Strasburg is omitted by Professor Hume Brown—presumably as being of too light and trivial a character to be worth recording—has its significance in this connection. But these two volumes do give us a most lucid and interesting survey of the whole mass of Goethe's work. Most of us probably know and love the wonderful series of lyrics in which he enshrined his experiences of life and of love, from his ardent youth right up to an old age which was serene and calm, "all passion spent," and also remarkably free from bitterness and disillusionment. He had from the very first "an experiencing nature," and an unequalled power of expressing himself in poetry, as those experiences had made him. But, of course, he was more than this—he was one of the great formative minds in European thought, and anyone who follows the development of his mind as it is expounded by Professor Hume Brown, and by Lord Haldane in his very illuminating chapter on the second part of "Faust," will understand how he came to be so. Browning's Grammarian, we are told, decided "not to live, but know." To Goethe, these two ideals of life did not exclude each other. If, on the one hand, he took all knowledge to be his province, and devoted much of his time to the study of natural science in many of its branches, and to that of art as well, yet on the other he intended to live, and did live, through the whole gamut of human emotion. He also left behind him an imposing mass of practical achievement, and was a very able and conscientious official and administrator. It is not without intention that he represents the Faust who has lived and loved and suffered as finding his most complete satisfaction at the last in the reclamation of a stretch of land from the ravages of the flood.

There is, of course, another side. The study of Goethe's life and of his loves leaves one with a certain sense of chill, as though he had deliberately used up the lives of others, and of women in particular, in

weaving the pattern of his own experience, and his lack of patriotism in face of the Napoleonic wars and the invasion of his country cannot fail to produce an unsympathetic impression. These failings, grave as they are, are, it seems to us, compensated for by the wisdom, the sense of proportion, and the firm grasp of the central realities of human life which are expressed in his work. The great problem which was never long absent from his mind was how to reconcile the demand of the human spirit for complete development of all its powers, with the equally imperious necessity laid upon it for concentration, discipline, and renunciation. The extent of his preoccupation with these and kindred questions, indeed, often interferes with the artistic perfection of his works, the longer ones especially being so overweighted with disquisitions on abstract subjects that the original design is apt to disappear altogether.

Goethe's religious attitude is difficult to sum up in a few words. He was from one point of view a mystic, to whom all Nature was, as he said himself, the living garment of the Godhead—and if Blake's green tree would not exactly have moved him to "tears of joy," yet neither would it have been to him only a "green thing standing in the way." Spinoza, we know, was to him almost the greatest of thinkers and teachers, and what the intellectual love of God represented to that great man probably most nearly expresses Goethe's ultimate view. But his mysticism is a purely intellectual passion, without any element of personal devotion in it, and while, as life went on, he drew nearer to Christianity as an ethical system, its "heart of fire"—in the sense of a personal relation to Christ—was surely never revealed to him. He believed in the necessity of redemption for man, but only in redemption as worked out by himself, in his own strength and in virtue of the God-given power within him, and in the second part of "Faust" it is by his own exertions that his salvation is represented to have been accomplished.

> Wer immer strebend sich bemüht
> Den können wir erlosen.

Yet, on the other hand, it is through the *Ewig-weibliche* that man is at length drawn up and absorbed into the Divine, and the closing passages of the drama are inspired with something more nearly approaching to spiritual passion than anything else which Goethe ever wrote, and which gives them a kind of unearthly beauty and pathos.

The development of the whole personality towards a definite goal, self-control, an unwearying pursuit of knowledge, love of the human race expressed in practical benevolence—these were the ideals according to which Goethe endeavoured to shape his life. And if he often fell short of them, both in his personal life and in his artistic achievement, yet in the end it may be said that no one ever strove after them more consistently, and that few nobler conceptions of life have ever been expressed by a poet than Goethe has left to us in the words

> Edel sei der Mensch,
> Hülfreich und gut!
> Denn das allein
> Unterscheidet ihn
> Von aller Wesen
> Die wir kennen.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY BILLING AND SONS, LTD., GUILDFORD AND ESHER